Imprimatur.

Januarii 11. 1686.

Henricus Maurice R^mo P. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacris.

Imprimatur.

Januarii 11. 1686.

Henricus Maurice R^mo P. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacris.

[Louis Du Four de Longuerue] [Louis Dufour] 1st edn

Wing D2451

A

TREATISE

WRITTEN

By an AUTHOR of the Communion of the CHURCH of *ROME*.

TOUCHING

Transubstantiation.

WHEREIN

Is made appear, That according to the PRINCIPLES of That CHURCH, This DOCTRINE cannot be an ARTICLE of FAITH.

LONDON,

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in S. *Paul*'s Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVII.

(10)

THE PREFACE.

IT is well known that there are in the Communion of the Church of Rome, *a great many Learned Persons, that do not approve of all which it teacheth, and that do earnestly long for a Reformation, although they remain within its bosome. But it is no less true, that there's but very few, that have the courage to make their thoughts known, and 'tis no hard matter to guess at the Reasons of it.*

In the last Age, one Picherel, *and some others of great note, wrote solid Treatises on certain matters of Controversie, and explain'd themselves just as Protestants do now. And in the present,* Monsieur de Marca *did the same, on the Doctrine of the* Eucharist, *and* Barnes, *an Eminent* Benedictine, *on most of the principal Questions wherein Protestants differ from the Church of* Rome. *But as if every one feared such usage as Father* Paolo, *and poor* Barnes *found, for the Liberty they had taken, the works of these sincere and learned Men, have almost always been suppress't during their Life-time, and not suffer'd to come abroad till after their Decease.*

It is therefore something more than ordinary, to behold the Work of a Person now living, and of the Communion of the Church of Rome, *that dares shew the like affection for the Reformation of his Church in the Doctrine of the*

Euchariſt, *and that heartily wiſhes, the Biſhops and Clergy of* France, *would take it into their ſerious conſideration. This Perſon is conſiderable for his Quality, but much more for his great Learning. He was an intimate friend of the late* Monſieur de Launoy's, *a noted Divine of the Faculty of* Paris, *who mightily deſired to ſee a free Council, wherein Men might ſpeak their thoughts touching the Reforming of the* Romiſh *Church; and it plainly appears he was of the ſame judgment with this Eminent Perſon, touching the Doctrine of* Tranſubſtantiation.

The Reader may reſt aſſured that the Author's Manuſcript Copy has been exactly follow'd in the Edition of this Work; which not only his Letters, now in our Hands, will juſtifie, but alſo the Original of theſe Papers, which he ſent to a Friend to be Printed.

It is to be hoped the World will not take it ill, if the Author of this Work be not more particularly deſcribed, which could not be done without expoſing him to the malice of thoſe who uſe all manner of ways to deſtroy ſuch of their party, as do own the Truth. It nearly behoves the Biſhops and Clergy of France, *to make ſome ſerious Reflections upon what the Author thought fit to repreſent to them concerning* Tranſubſtantiation. *The ſame might have been ſaid to the other Articles of the* Romiſh *belief, which are rejected by Proteſtants, as ſo many additions to the ancient Faith of the Primitive Chriſtians; which are impos'd upon Mens conſciences by the Clergy, by ſuch unheard-of ways, and that are ſo contrary to the nature of Religion. If ſuch Remonſtrances as theſe, are not of ſufficient force to make them change their proceedings againſt Proteſtants; they will at leaſt ſerve to ſhew their Injuſtice before Men, and will one day aggravate their condemnation before the Tribunal of God.*

Place this betwixt the *Preface* and the *Book*.

THE CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Method proposed by the Assembly of the Clergy of *France* to judge of Articles of Faith. *Pag.* 1
This Method admitted by Protestants. 2
Transubstantiation to be Examined by it. ib.

PART I.

THAT several of the Doctors of the Church of *Rome* have confess'd that *Transubstantiation* is no ancient Doctrine. 3

So *Suarez.* 3
Scotus. ib.
D'Alliaco. ib.
Card. Cusa. ib.
Erasmus. ib.
Alphonsus à Castro. 4
Tonstal. Bishop of *Durham.* ib.
Cassander. ib.
Ch. du Moulin. ib.
J. Tribarne. ib.
Mons. de Marca. ib.

PART II.

THAT the Ancients did not believe *Transubstantiation.*

Proved: In GENERAL.

First, The *Papists* themselves confess, that *Transubstantiation* is not expressly mentioned nor taught in Scripture. 5

So, *Scotus*. ib. | *Gabriel Biel*. ib.
Ockham. ib.
Alphonsus de Castro. ib. | *Card. Cajetane*. ib.

Secondly, That *Transubstantiation* comprehending infinite difficulties, we do not yet find that either the *Jews* or *Gentiles* have objected any thing to the Christians in their disputes against it. ib.

Not { *Trypho*. *Celsus*. *Julian*. } ib.

Who yet have traduced most of the Mysteries of our Religion. 7

Which plainly shews that *Transubstantiation* was not then known. ib.

In PARTICULAR.

Transubstantiation was not believed by any of the Fathers of the Church. This shewn in those of the several Ages.

CENT. II.

Justine Martyr. 8
Irenaus. 9
Clemens Alexandr. 10
Theodotus. ib.

CENT. III.

Tertullian. 11
Origen. 13
Cyprian. 15

CENT. IV.

Eusthathius. 16
Eusebius Cæsariensis. ib.
Cyrillus Hierosol. 17
Macharius. ib.
S. Basil. 18
Ephram. ib.
Epiphanius. 19
Gregorius Naz. ib.

Gregorius

Gregorius Nyſſen. 20
S. *Ambroſe.* 21
Gaudentius. 22
S. *Chryſoſtome.* ib.

CENT. V.

S. *Jerome.* 26
S. *Auguſtine.* 27
Theodoret. 37
Arnobius Jun. 38
Proſper. ib.
Heſychius. 39
Procopius Gazens. ib.
P. *Gelaſius.* 40

CENT. VI.

Fulgentius. 41
Ephrem de Conte. ib.
Facundus. ib.
Primaſius. 42

CENT. VII, VIII.

Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis. 43
Beda. 44
Sedulius. ib.
Jo. Damaſcenus. ib.
Concil. Conſtantinop. 45
Alcuinus. 46
Carolus M. 47
Officium Ambroſianum. ib.
Ordo Romanus ib.

CENT. IX.

Theodorus Studita. 48
Ahyto. ib.
Theodulphus. 49
Rabanus. 51
Amalarius. 52
Walafridus Strabo. 54
Herribald. ib.
Trudegard. 55
Ratramne. ib.
Jo. Erigena. 56
Prudentius. 58
Chriſtian Drutmar. ib.
Florus Diacon. 60

CENT. X.

Alferic, A. B. *Cant.* 61
Wolphinus. ib.
Saxon Homil. ib.
Fulcuinus. 62
Herriger. ib.
Monaſt. Cluny. ib.
Ratherius. 63

CENT. XI.

Auth. Life of S. *Genulphe.* 64
Leuthericus. ib.
Fulbertus. ib.
Berno. 65
Bruno. 66
Gregory VII. P. ib.
Theophylact. 67
Nicetas Pectoratus. ib.
Chronicon Malleac. ib.

CENT. XII.

Honorius 67
Rupertus. 68
Zonaras. ib.
Amalarius. ib.

CENT.

CENT. XIII, &c.

Of the Council of Lateran. 69

That ſeveral after it did not believe *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Guido le Gros. 69
Reginald Peacock. 70
Guido Cluv. 71
Jo. of *Paris.* ib.
Albert. M. 72
Durand. ib.
Cornelius Bp. of *Bitonte.* ib.
Dominicus Bannes. ib.

CONCLUS.

To the Clergy of France, *that they ought not to preſs upon the Proteſtants the belief of* Tranſubſtantiation. 72

A TREATISE

A TREATISE OF Transubstantiation.

Written by one of the

CHURCH of ROME.

THE Bishops of *France* in their last *Assembly* held at *Paris* in the year 1682. compos'd a *Pastoral Letter* addressed to the Protestants, to invite them to return to the Communion of the Church of *Rome*. And because in order to put an end to their differences in Matters of Religion, some *Rule* must be agreed on to be received by the different Parties; they laid down several Principles which they called *Methods*, as fit to be made use of, whereby to judge what should be received as an *Article of Faith*.

The Clergy of *France*'s Method to judge of Articles of Faith.

In the Fourth *Method* they laid down as a *Maxim*, that the true means to discern what relates to matter of Faith, or not, is to see if the Article which is to be admitted, was always believed as Matter of Faith, that is to say, *that* the French Bishops admitted in their pastoral Letter, the Maxim which *Vincentius Lyrinensis* left us above 1100. years ago, *That great Care must be taken to retain in the Catholick Church, what has been believed every where, by all, and at all times*, as being the true Means whereby to discern what is Matter of Faith, and what is not. This same is the Rule given by Pope *Pius* the Fourth, who obliges them to swear in the profession of Faith, added to the Council of *Trent*,

That

† *Secundum unanimem consensum Patrum.*

That the Holy Scriptures should not be Interpreted, † *But by the unanimous consent of the Ancient Fathers.*

Admitted by the Protestants.

The Protestants have thought this Maxim so reasonable, that Monsieur *Larroque* a French Minister, saith in his Preface to the *History of the Eucharist*, that he believes there is no Man of Sense, but ought to admit of it. And it was received as a *Rule of Faith* by the Reform'd *Church of England*, by *Philip Melancthon*, by *Peter Martyr*, *Gallasius*, *Scultetus*, *Casaubon*, *Grotius*, *Vossius*, *Beza*, and by *Gesselius*, (who recites their Authorities,) in the Preface of his *History of Memorable things from the Creation of the World*, *to the year of Christ* 1125.

Transubstantiation to be examined by it.

Seeing therefore that the Bishops of *France* have propos'd to us so [illegible], let us examine if the Doctrin of *Transubstantiation* be a *Doctrin of Faith*, and prove it, not because the *Council* of *Trent* has defin'd it so; Or that the *Council* of *Lateran* in the year 1215. suppos'd it to be so, *non quia ipsam quam tenemus fidem commendaverit Milevitanus Optatus, vel Mediolanensis Ambrosius, aut quia Collegarum Nostrorum Conciliis ipsa prædicta est*, saith S. *Austin* against the Donatists, *De unit. Eccles.* cap. 16. But because 'tis contain'd in the *Holy Scriptures*, and understood in that Sense by the unanimous consent of the *Doctors* and *Councils* that have gone before us.

This is what we now undertake to perform by the assistance of God's holy Spirit, and with a disposition of Mind free from all Malice and Prejudice, according to what *Cæsar* saith in *Salust*, in the beginning of the Book of *Cataline*, *Omnes homines qui de Rebus dubiis consultant, ab ira & odio vacuos esse debere, & haud facile animum pervidere verum, ubi illa officiunt.* And St. *Austin* upon the Book against the Letter of the *Manichean*, by them called the Letter of Foundation; *Ut autem facilius mitescatis, &c. nemo nostrum se jam queramus quasi ab utrisque nesciatur, ita enim diligenter & concorditer quæri poterit, si nulla temeraria præsumtione inventa & cognita esse credatur.*

But not to over-burthen this small Treatise with too great a number of Arguments or Citations, we will chiefly examine two things; First, *Who those Catholick Doctors are, that believed the Doctrine of* Transubstantiation *not to be ancient.* Secondly, *If what those Doctors have writ be true? And whether we can indeed produce sufficient Authorities to believe that the ancient Church did not hold nor believe it.*

THE

PART I.

IN the first place, That there have been Catholick Doctors which have taught, that *Transubstantiation* is no ancient Doctrine, * *Suarez* formally asserteth it, although indeed he saith, their Opinion ought to be corrected. The truth is, ∴ *Peter Lombard* Master of the Sentences, saith expresly, *Si quaras qualis sit illa conversio, an formalis, an substantialis, an alterius generis, definire non audeo.*

Several Doctors of the Church of Rome have believed the Doctrin of Transubstantiation not to be very ancient.

Secondly, † *Scotus* saith, That there were formerly three Opinions touching the changing the *Bread* into the *Body of Christ*, the first of which held that the *Bread* remain'd in the *Eucharist*, In the Paragraph, *quantum ergo ad istum articulum*, &c. he saith, that at present the *Church* of *Rome* holds *Transubstantiation*. *Nunc autem ipsa tenet (Sancta Rom. Ecclesia) panem transubstantiari.* And a little under, he saith, *ad tertium ubi stat vis, dicendum quod Ecclesia declaravit istum intellectum esse de veritate fidei, in illo Symbolo edito sub Innocentio tertio in Concilio Lateranensi.* And since this Declaration made by this Council held in the year 1215. it is an Article of Faith. *Tenendum est esse de substantia fidei, & hoc post istam declarationem solemnem.* * *Bellarmine* doth own that *Scotus* did believe *Transubstantiation* was no Article of Faith before the *Council* of *Lateran* under *Innocent* the Third; but he adds, that 'twas because *Scotus* did not know of the Council held under *Gregory the Seventh*, and that he had not read the Authorities of the Fathers which saith *Bellarmin*, I have now recited.

* *SUAREZ in 3. Tom. in Euch. Disp. 70. Sect. 2.*
∴ *Lombard l. 4. d. 11.*
† *Scotus in 4. d. 11. q. 3. §. Hæc duo videnda.*
* *Lib. 3. de Euch. cap. 23.*

Thirdly, † *Peter Dayly*, Cardinal and Bishop of *Cambray* saith, It doth not clearly follow from the Determination of the Church, that the substance of Bread ceaseth, therefore he doth not believe this to be the ancient Doctrine.

† *P. Dayly on 4th Sent. q. 6. Art. 4.*

Fourthly, * Cardinal *Cusa*, Excit. l. 6. Serm. 40. *Super una Oblatione, consummavit, &c.* saith, That there were some ancient Divines which did not believe *Transubstantiation.*

* *Card. Cusa.*

Fifthly, † *Erasmus* in his Notes on the First to the *Corinthians*, saith, That it was late ere the Church established *Transubstantiation.*

† *Erasmus.*

* *Alphonsus à Castro Lib. 8. contr. Hæres.*

* Sixthly, *Alphonsus à Castro*, saith, That the ancient Writers very seldom spake of *Transubstantiation.*

† *Tonstal Lib. 1. of the Sacrament.*

Seventhly, † *Torstall* Bishop of *Durham* about the middle of the last Century, speaking of the *Breads* being chang'd into the *Body of Christ*, saith, It were much better to leave it to the Liberty of Christians to believe as they pleas'd, of the manner in which this change is made, as it was practis'd in the Church, before the Council of *Lateran.*

Cassander.

Eighthly, *Cassander* in his Consultation with the Emperour *Maximilian* the Second, touching the differences of Religion, confesseth that *Transubstantiation* is a Novelty, and that 'twere much better to keep to the terms of the Ancients, that the Abuses therein, *approach near to Idolatry.*

Du Moulin.

Ninthly, *Charles du Moulin*, the Oracle of the *French* Civilians, upon the *Edicts and Ordinances of* France, *against the Injuries of Popes*, Num. 406. speaks in these Terms; *Innocent* the Third forged, or at least established it as a general Article of Faith, and as necessary to be believed by all, as that of the holy Trinity, the *Transubstantiation* of the *Bread* and *Wine* into the *true Body* and *true Blood* of Jesus Christ.

Jo. Tribarne

Tenthly, *John Tribarne* a *Spanish* Divine, in the 4th. Sent. Dist. 11. q. 3. Disp. 42. S. 1. saith, That in the Primitive Church it was matter of Faith, that the *Body* of *Jesus Christ* was contain'd under the Species of *Bread* and *Wine*, but that 'twas not any matter of Faith to hold that the *substance* of *Bread* was changed into the *Flesh* of *Jesus Christ*, and that it subsisted no longer after Consecration.

De Marca.

Eleventhly, Monsieur *de Marca*, Archbishop of *Paris* in his Posthumous Dissertations, saith, in his *French* Treatise of the *Sacrament of the Eucharist*, That until S. *Chrysostom*'s time, it was believed the *Bread* was the *Body* of *Jesus Christ* by a marvelous change that comes on the *Bread*; but that it becomes united to the incarnate Word and to his Natural Body, the Bread not changing its Nature, and yet not going into the Draught; which is a kind of pious consideration which he added against *Origen.*

PART

PART II.

AS for the *Second Point*, which is to see if there is effectively to be found in the Writings of the Ancients, sufficient Authorities to believe that the *Ancients* did not believe *Transubstantiation*.

That the Ancients indeed did not believe *Transubstantiation*.

Before I alledge their Authorities, two Reflections may be made.

First, that our own Authors do observe, that *Transubstantiation* is not expresly mention'd nor taught in the Scriptures. * *Scotus* cited by *Bellarmine*, of the Eucharist, *Lib.* 3. *cap.* 23. saith, It doth not plainly follow from the words of Jesus Christ, *This is my Body*, that the Bread is *transubstantiated*.

Obs. 1. The Papists confess that it is not expresly in Scripture. So

* *Scotus.*

† *Ockham* saith of *Transubstantiation*, that it cannot be proved by natural Reason, nor by Authority of the Bible, but only by the Authority of the Ancients.

† *Ockham. Lib.* 4. *q.* 34.

* *Alfonsus de Castro* disapproves what *Ockham* says, that it can be proved by the Authority of the Ancients, for he saith, that it was not to be found, no more than *Indulgences* were, in the Writings of the Ancients.

* *Alfonsus de Castro Vocabulo Indulgentia.*

Gabriel † *Biel* speaking of *Transubstantiation*, saith, That it is not expresly taught in the Holy Scriptures.

† *Biel. Lect.* 40. *in Can. Mis.*

Cardinal * *Cajetan* does not find the words of Jesus Christ, *This is my Body*, clear, neither for the *Real Presence*, nor for *Transubstantiation*, without the determination of the *Church* be joyned to them.

* *CAJETAN in* 3 *p.* 8. *Th.* 9. 75. *Art.* 7.

The second Reflection, is that *Transubstantiation* comprehending a great many Difficulties quite contrary to natural Reason, none of the Jews nor Pagan Philosophers, disputing against the ancient Christians, ever dream'd of making any Objections against it in their Disputations. *Trypho* the Jew charges us with things monstrous, incredible, and strangely invented; as what we teach of *Jesus Christ*'s *being before Aaron*, and *Abraham*, that *he took on him our Nature*, that *he was born of a Virgin*, that

Obs. 2. None of the Pagans objected to the ancient Christians the difficulties of it. Not *Trypho*.

God should be born, be made Man; that *we should adore a Man*, that *we should put our trust in him*, and *that we should invoke another God besides the Creator*, all this appears in S. *Justin Martyr*, in his *Dialogue* against *Trypho*.

The *Pagans* reproach us for saying *God* has a *Son*, that this *Son should appear in humane shape*, and they stile it *the Follies of the Christian Discipline*; that *God should be born*, and that he should *be born of a Virgin*, and be *a God of Flesh*, *crucified and buried*; The last *Judgment*, the *pains of eternal Fire*, the *Joys of Heaven*, the *Resurrection of the Dead*. All this appears by *Clement* of *Alexandria Stromat.* l. 6. by *Tertullian* his *Apologet.* ch. 21. 47. in his *Treatise* of the *Flesh of Christ*, chap. 4. and 5. And in his *Treatise* of the *Testimony of the Soul*, chap. 4. By S. *Justine* in his second *Apology*, and *Arnobius* in his second *Book*.

Nor *Celsus*. *L. 1. & 2. contr. Cels.*

Celsus, in * *Origen*, scoffs at the *Incarnation*, as of a thing unworthy of *God*. In the Sixth Book, he laughs that we should believe *God* should be *born of a Virgin*. In the Third and Eighth Book, he saith of *Christians*, That they honour with a *Religious Worship* even above all Religion, a Man that was a *Prisoner* and that *suffered Death*. He even thereby pleads for the plurality of his Gods: as if Christians were not satisfi'd in *worshipping one God*, under colour that they *adored Jesus Christ*; *If Christians*, saith he in the Eighth Book, *worshipped but one God, they might have some colour to despise others. But they pay infinite Honours to him that has but very lately appear'd, and yet they don't think they displease God when they serve and honour his Minister.*

Nor *Julian*.

Julian the *Apostate* oppos'd the *Mystery of the Incarnation*, the *Divinity of Jesus Christ*, the *Salvation he purchas'd for us by the price of his Blood*; he reproaches us with the glorious Title of *Mother of God*, which we give to the *Blessed Virgin*; he contests the *Mystery* of the *Trinity of Persons* and *Unity of Essence*, accusing us of contradicting *Moses*, who said, There is but *one God*. He reproaches us for *Baptism*; See, saith he, *what* Paul *saith to them, that they are sanctified and cleansed by Water, as if Water could penetrate to the Soul, to wash and purifie it*; *Baptism can't so much as cleanse a Leper, nor a Scurf, it cannot heal a Cancer nor the Gout.* He aggravates what we read, that God *visits the Iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children*, thereby to endeavour to attack the *Doctrine* of *Original Sin*. He boldly questions what *God* saith in the Book of *Numbers* touching *Phineas*,

Phineas, that thrust his Javelin through the Body of an *Israelite* that committed *Folly* with a *Midianitish Woman*, which turn'd away *God's* Anger from the *Children* of *Israel*, and hinder'd him from consuming them. *Let us suppose*, saith he, *that there had been to the Number of one Thousand that had attempted to have transgressed the Law of God, ought six hundred Thousand to have been destroy'd for the sake of one Thousand; it seems to me to have been much juster to have saved one ill Man with so many good ones, than to involve so many good Men in the ruine of one bad one.*

There's scarce any of our *Mysteries* that have not been censur'd by the *Jews* or *Pagans*; yet 'tis very strange that not one should accuse us of admitting in the *Eucharist*, *accidents* without *substance*, *whiteness* without any thing that's *white*, *roundness* without any thing *round*; *weight* without any thing that's *weighty*; a *corruption* whereunto the *species* are subject, without any thing that's capable of being *corrupted*; a *Nourishment* in the *Symbols*, without any thing that can *nourish*; a power in the *Wine* to be felt without any thing that may be smelled. No body ever reproach'd us with so strange a thing, that a Man with one word should destroy a substance which he holdeth in his hands, and that nevertheless against the testimony of all the Senses, I *see* that which is *no more*; I *feel* that which I do *not feel*, I *taste* that which I do *not taste*, I *understand* that which I do *not understand*; I *touch* that which I do *not touch*, that I should be *nourished* with *nothing*; that my *taste* should be delighted with *nothing*; that my *Eyes* and *Ears* should be struck with *Nothing*

The three Reflections we have hitherto made, That many of the antient Catholick Doctors have not believed *Transubstantiation* to be antient; That they have judged it could not evidently be deduced from the *Holy Scriptures*; and, That the antient Pagan *Philosophers* have not reproached us with it, are three very strong Suppositions to make us mightily doubt the *Antiquity* of this *Doctrine*. But to shew evidently that 'twas but in the *last Ages* that this opinion was made an *Article of Faith*, we need only consult the Doctors of the *Primitive Church*, and see if they have effectively explain'd the *Eucharist* by the *Systeme of Transubstantiation*.

Hence it follows, that *Transubstantiation* was not ancient.

That

AGE ii.
Just. Martyr

That the Fathers of the SECOND CENTURY *did not believe* Transubstantiation.

Apol. 2.

S. *Justin Martyr* saith, "*That after the common Prayers were* "*ended, there was presented to the chief of the Brethren,* "*which was God's Minister, the* Bread *and the* Wine, *mixt with* "Water, *which he receiv'd into his hands, and giving thanks and* "*glory to the Father of Heaven and Earth, through Jesus* "*Christ his Son, and the Holy Ghost, &c. and the said* President "*or* Minister *having ended his thanksgiving, the People ha-* "*ving all said* Amen, *those whom we call* Deacons *and* Ministers, *at-* "*tending on this Holy Service, give to every one present at the Holy* "*Communion, part of this Holy Bread, so blessed and glorify'd; and* "*also of the Holy liquor mixt of Wine and Water, upon which Prayers* "*had been made.* And a little lower, "*Behold, Lord, we do not* "*receive this* Bread *nor this* Wine *as common* Bread *and* Wine, "*but as Jesus Christ is become* Flesh *and* Blood *by the Word, so also* "*the nourishment which by the Word is become a* Sacrament, *and* "*of which by* conversion and change, our flesh and Blood are "nouriſh'd, *is as we have learned, the* Flesh and Blood *of Jesus Christ* "*incarnate.*

If St. *Justin* had believed that the substance of the *Bread, Wine,* and *Water* had been *changed* after Consecration, so that they had been destroy'd, how could he have said, that after Consecration the Deacons did distribute to the People the *Bread,* the *Wine,* and the *Water*?

Secondly, When he saith, we do not take this *Bread* and *Wine* as *common Bread and Wine*: this language amongst the antient Doctors intimates, that both the one and the other do still subsist, but that by Consecration, they have acquir'd a new use and quality. As when *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* Catech. 3. *Ad Illum.* saith, *Approach not to Baptism as to common Water.* Or as *Gregory Nyssen* saith of Baptism, *Do not despise the Holy Font, and look not upon it as common Water.*

To conclude, this blessed Martyr saith, Our *Body* and *Blood are nouriſh'd by the change of the Eucharistical food, which converts* and

AGE ii.

Justin Martyr.

and turns it self into our Flesh and Blood. These words plainly shew, that 'tis the Bread and Wine which are turn'd into our *Substance*, into our *Flesh*, and into our *Blood*, seeing that tis 'certain, that the *real Flesh and Blood* of Jesus Christ, is not converted into our *Flesh* and *Blood*. So when *Justin* saith, That the Sacramental Food is the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ, that imports, that 'tis not common *Bread and Wine*, but a *Bread* and Wine which is to be consider'd as the *Flesh* and *Blood of* the *Word incarnate*.

Irenæus

S. *Irenæus* proves against *Valentine* and his followers, that our Bodies shall not be destroy'd, and by consequence that they shall be raised incorruptible by receiving the Sacrament, as the *Bread* of the *Eucharist* becomes supernatural by the invocation of the Holy Ghost.

We establish in the Eucharist, saith S. Irenæus, *the Communion and unity of the Flesh and of the Spirit; for as the Bread which is of the Earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common Bread, but is the Sacrament compos'd of two things, one Terrestrial, and the other Celestial: So also our Bodies which receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, but have the Hope of a future Resurrection.* *Adversus Hæres. l. 4. c. 24.*

This passage doth suppose, that the *Bread* remains in the *Eucharist*; in the first place, because if Consecration did destroy the *substance* of the *Bread* and *Wine*, it must be confess'd the Holy Doctor had taken wrong measures, to shew that the Flesh is not destroy'd by the grace of the Holy Spirit, by the Bread of the Eucharist, which it self should be destroy'd by the grace of the Spirit which comes upon it.

Secondly, Because a little before, *Irenæus* saith, *How is it they say, the Flesh shall be destroy'd and turn to corruption, seeing it is nourish'd with the body and blood of Christ?*

Now the *Flesh* is fed by the conversion of nourishment into the body, which not being to be said of *Jesus Christ*, is only to be apply'd to the *Bread*. Moreover these words, That *the Eucharist is compos'd of two things*, sufficiently shew, that the *Bread* remains; for to say *Irenæus* means by a *Terrestrial thing*, the *accidents* of *Bread* and *Wine*, besides that *S. Austin* saith in the second Book of *Soliloquies*, Chap. 12. that 'tis a thing monstrous to say that accidents subsist without a subject; *Irenæus* also himself saith, Book 2. cap. 14. that Water cannot be without moisture, Fire without heat, a Stone without hardness. For these things are so united, that the one cannot be separated from the other, but the one must subsist in the other. So in like manner, by this *Terrestrial thing* must be understood

AGE ii.

understood the *Bread*, as S. *Gregory Naz.* saith in his fourth Oration according to *Billius* his version, *Baptism also is compos'd of two things, Water and the Spirit; the one is visible and is meant in a corporal manner, but the other is invisible and operates after a spiritual manner; the one is Typical, the other cleanseth that which is inward, and most hidden.*

Irenæus.

Clem. Alexand. Pædag. l. 2.

Clement of *Alexandria* saith the same in different terms. *The* "Blood *of Christ is twofold, the one is* carnal, *whereby we are* "*deliver'd from corruption, the other is* spiritual, *whereby we* "*are anointed, and that is to* drink *the* Blood *of Jesus Christ, to* "*be partakers of the incorruption of the Lord. Now the virtue* "*of the Word is the Holy Spirit, as the Blood is the virtue of the* "*Flesh. By Analogy then, the Wine, mixt with Water, as* "*the Spirit with Man; and this mixture makes the Wine the* "*pleasanter to drink, but the Spirit leadeth to incorruption. Now* "*this mixture of the one with the other, to wit, of the Wine and* "*the Word, is called* Eucharist, *which is highly esteem'd, whereby those* "*who worthily partake of it by Faith, are sanctify'd both in their* "*Body and Soul.*

Græcè *κρᾶσις* signifies mixture.

When *Clement* of *Alexandria* said that the *Eucharist* is a mixture of *Wine* and the *Word*, it is a composition, a mixture, which could not be, if there was but the Word only in the Eucharist. For a mixture is at least of two things. So the Fathers have called *Jesus Christ*, a mixture of *God* and *Man*. *The Body of Man*, saith S. Austin, *is a mixture of Body and Soul; the Person of Christ is a mixture of God and Man.*

S. Austin Ep. 3. ad *Volusen.*

Theodotus.

The Epitome of *Theodotus* saith, *The Bread and Oyl are sanctified by the virtue of the name, and they remain not what they were before, though to look on them they seem to be the same, but by virtue, they are changed into a Spiritual force. So water sanctified is become Baptism, it not only retains what's less, but also acquires a sanctification.*

The author saith, The *Bread* is *changed*, but when he adds that 'tis into a *Spiritual virtue*, he quite excludes the change of its *substance*; for by *virtue*, and *Spiritual*, cannot be understood any other change but that of *virtue* and *quality*, seeing this Author speaks of this change, as being common to the Water of Baptism, to the Oyl of Unction, and to the Bread of the Eucharist.

That

That the Fathers of the THIRD CENTURY *did not believe* Transubstantiation.

AGE iii.

Tertullian.

TErtullian in his first Book against *Marcion*, shewing that Jesus Christ is not contrary to the Creator, as this Heretick affirm'd, saith in his 14th. Chap. *Hitherto Jesus Christ has not condemn'd the Water wherewith he cleanseth his Children, nor the Oyl wherewith he anoints them, nor the Hony nor the Milk whereby he makes them his Children, nor the Bread by which he represents his body.*

By this passage, the *Bread represents the Body of Jesus Christ*, therefore the *Bread* remains in the Sacrament, and this *Bread* is not *really* Jesus Christ, because what doth *represent*, is another thing than what is *represented.*

Two things have been said on this place of *Tertullian*; first, that the *Bread* signifies the *accidents of Bread*; the second that the Word *represent*, does signify in this place, *to make present*: As when in a Court of Justice a Prisoner is made appear as often as he is demanded.

Against the former, there's no reason to believe that *Tertullian* speaking of *Water*, of *Oyl*, of *Hony*, and *Milk*, should intend to speak of their *accidents*, but of their very *substance*, and that speaking of *Bread*, he should speak only of its *accidents.*

Against the second it's most certain that in matter of Sacraments, the term to *signify* is taken literally, to *signify*. S. *Austin* saith, Ep. 5. *the signs, when applyed to Holy things, are called Sacraments. Tertullian* explains himself clearly Lib. 3. against *Marcion*, so that there's no cause of doubting, when he saith, *That Jesus Christ has given to the Bread the priviledge of being the figure of his Body.* The same *Tertullian* lib. 4. *contra Marcion.* cap. 40. doth prove that *Jesus Christ* had a *real Body*, and not one in *shew* only, as *Marcion* dream'd, and he proves it by this argument: That which hath a *figure* ought to be *real* and *true*;

A. E iii.

now Jesus Christ hath in the Eucharist a *figure of his Body*, therefore the *Body* of Jesus Christ is *real* and *true*, and not a *Phantome*.

Tertullian.

Jesus Christ, saith *Tertullian*, *having taken the Bread which he attributed amongst his Disciples, he made it his Body, saying, This is the figure of my Body: now it had been no figure, if Jesus Christ had not had a real and true Body; for an empty thing as a Phantasm is, is not capable of having any figure.*

From hence 'tis concluded, that the *Bread* being the *figure of the Body of Jesus Christ*, and that which is a *figure*, being distinguished from the thing *signified*, the *Bread* of the *Eucharist* is not *properly* and *truly* the *Body* of *Jesus Christ*, and so the *Bread* is not destroy'd, but remains to be the *figure* of the *Body* of *Jesus Christ*.

If it be said, the *Bread* is destroy'd, and that the *accidents* of *Bread* are the *figure* of the *Body* of *Jesus Christ*, this gives up the victory to *Marcion*, to prove, that Jesus Christ had a *true Body*, and not one in *shew only*, because Jesus Christ hath in the *Eucharist* the *figure* of *Bread*, which is *Bread* only in appearance. *Marcion* might have retorted the argument and said, according to you, *Tertullian*, the Sacrament is the *figure* of the *Body* of Jesus Christ; now as this *figure* is *Bread* in *appearance*, and is called *Bread* only because of the outward *accidents* and *qualities* which it retains, so also the *Body* of Jesus Christ was only a *Body* in *appearance*, and was called a *Body* because it had the outward *accidents and qualities*.

Again, as *Tertullian* saith, That Jesus Christ distributed to his Disciples the *Bread* which he had taken to make it the *figure of his Body*; it is most certain he took true *Bread*, and by consequence, that he distributed *true Bread*.

The same *Tertullian* in his *Treatise of the Soul*, disputing against the *Academitians* that question'd the truth of the testimony of the *Senses*, saith to them, that we must not at all doubt of the testimony of the Senses, lest occasion might farther be taken to doubt the actions of the humanity of Jesus Christ, that it might not be said, That it was untrue that he saw *Satan* fall from Heaven; That it was not true, that he heard the Father's voice from heaven bearing witness to his Son;

That

That he was deceived when he touched *Peter's* Wife's Mother; That he was deceived when he smelt the sweet odour which he was pleas'd to accept for the preparation to his Death; or, That he tasted the Wine that he consecrated in remembrance of his Blood.

AGE iii. *Tertullian.*

It is evident that to consecrate *Wine* in remembrance of *Blood*, cannot be understood of a *substance* which is destroy'd all saving the *accidents*; This manner of expression in the language of the Ancients signifying no more, but that a substance remains always in its first state, only attains to a higher degree, which is, to be the Sacrament of a Heavenly and supernatural thing. To conclude, if *Tertullian* had believed that the Wine had been destroy'd, and that nothing but the appearance was left, against the testimony of all the Senses, had it not been an unpardonable fault in *Tertullian*, to prove that the Senses could not be deceived by the Example of the *Eucharist*, where the Senses are quite deceived?

Origen.

Origen did not believe *Transubstantiation* when he said in his Commentary on the 13th. Chap. of S. *Matth.* expounding these words of the *Gospel*, *what enters into the Mouth* "*defiles not the Man* &c. *as there's nothing that's impure of it self* "*to him that's polluted and incredulous, but a thing is impure,* "*by reason of his impurity and incredulity; so also, that which* "*is sanctifyed by the word of God and Prayer, doth not sanctify* "*by its proper nature, him that uses it: If it were so, it would* "*also sanctify him that eats unworthily of the Lord, and none* "*should have been weak, nor sick, nor should have fallen asleep,* "*by reason of so eating*———. *If all that enters into the Mouth* "*goes into the Belly, and there is cast out into the draught, this food* "*which is sanctifyed by the word of God, and by Prayer, goes* "*also into the Belly and is cast out into the draught, according to* "*its material substance; But according to the Prayer which has* "*been thereunto added, it becomes profitable according to the* "*measure of Faith, by causing the mind to become inlightned,* "*having regard to what is profitable; And 'tis not the matter* "*of Bread, but the words which have been pronounc'd upon it,* "*that avails him which eateth in such a manner as is not unwor-* "*thy of the Lord, and this may be said of the Body Typical, or* "*Symbolical; Many things might be said also of the Word made* "*Flesh,*

Du Perron saith on this passage, *Christians, stop your Ears.*

AGE iii. Origen.

"*Flesh, and true nourishment, the which whosoever eats shall*
"*never dye, and which no wicked person can eat; for could it be*
"*that he which continues wicked should eat of the Word incarnate,*
"*seeing he is the Word and Bread of Life, it would not have been*
"*written, Whosoever eateth this Bread shall live Eternally.*

When he saith of the *Bread* of the *Eucharist*, that it sanctifieth not of it self, it cannot be understood of the *true Body* of Jesus Christ, but of the Bread which remains. When he saith, This Bread sanctified by the invocation of God, and by Prayer, remains in its material being, it means plainly, That it remains in its former substance. When he saith, That this Bread as to the matter of it goes down into the Belly, and is cast into the draught as the other meats: This not being to be understood of *Jesus Christ* without Blaspheming, is necessarily to be understood of the *Bread*. When he calls this *Bread* the *Typical Body*, it shews plainly, That this not being the *true Body*, it is not *Transubstantiated*. When having spoken of the *Typical Body*, he after speaks of the *Word* made *Flesh*, which cannot but give life to those which eat and receive him; he sufficiently distinguisheth the *Bread* of the *Eucharist* from *Jesus Christ*; the former of which may be mortal, but the latter can never be so to those who receive and eat him.

This passage is so clear and evident, that *Sixtus Senensis* in his Bibl. *l.* 6. annot. 66. found no better expedient than to say, That 'twas probable, This passage had been corrupted by the *Hereticks*. *Gennebrard* and *Du Perron* suspected *Erasmus* to have ill translated it: But the learned Monsieur *Huet*, nominated to be Bishop of *Soissons*, saith, It evidently appears by the Original *Greek*, that this passage is no way changed.

Origeniana l. 2. *q.* 34.

Pag. 411. Edit. Huet. G. L.

The same *Origen* saith, in *Tom.* 32. of his Commentary on S. *John*, that the morsel of *Bread* Christ gave to *Judas* and those he gave the *Apostles*, saying, *Take, Eat*, were of the same sort. Now if the morsel given to *Judas* was *true Bread*, as it is granted, and if the *Bread* given the other Apostles was not true *Bread*, then the one and the other were not of the same kind.

The

The ſame in the Seventh Homily on *Leviticus*, ſaith, That *Jeſus Chriſt* before his Paſſion, drank Wine, but being ready to ſuffer, he refuſed to drink it; *Ubi vero tempus advenit Crucis ſuæ, accipiens, inquit, Calicem benedixit, & dedit Diſcipulis ſuis, dicens, Accipite & Bibite ex hoc. Vos, inquit, bibite quia non acceſſuri eſtis ad altare, ipſe autem tanquam acceſſurus ad altare dicit, Amen, dico vobis quia non bibam de generatione vitis hujus, uſque quò bibam illud novum vobiſcum in Regno Patris mei.* *Origen* affirms, That our Saviour in celebrating the *Euchariſt*, did not drink Wine, becauſe he was ready to approach the Altar (of his Paſſion) and that the Apoſtles did drink Wine, becauſe they were not yet ready to approach to the Altar of Martyrdom. And that in this ſenſe, the Figure of the Old Teſtament was accompliſhed, where 'twas forbidden to *Aaron* and his Prieſts to drink Wine when they were about to approach to the Altar. All this Diſcourſe is falſe, if Jeſus Chriſt ſpake not theſe words of *true Wine*, *I will not drink*, &c. and if what the Apoſtles drank was not *true Wine*. *Origen.*

Let us ſee now what St. *Cyprian* ſaith, *The Sacrifice of the Lord recommends to us Unity: for when Jeſus Chriſt called his Body, the Bread which is made of ſeveral Grains, he recommended the Unity of Chriſtian People; and when he called his Blood, the Wine, made of ſeveral Grains and Grapes, he repreſented one Flock, united by the Band of Charity.* Now theſe words, where Jeſus Chriſt called the *Bread* his *Body*, and the *Wine* his *Blood*, is as if he had ſaid of the *Bread*, *This is my Body*, and of the *Wine*, *This is my Blood*. And if hereunto we add the words of the Jeſuite *Salmeron*, who ſaid, *If Jeſus Chriſt had ſaid, This Bread is my Body, and this Wine is my Blood, it would have obliged us to have underſtood theſe words in a figurative ſenſe, becauſe the Bread cannot be a humane Body, nor the Wine Blood, but in a figurative Senſe.* *Bellarmine* ſaith the ſame; *If Jeſus Chriſt had ſaid, This Bread is my Body, this propoſition muſt be underſtood in a figurative Senſe; otherwiſe the Expreſſion would be abſurd and impoſſible.* Now as we ſee S. *Cyprian* ſaith, that *Jeſus Chriſt* ſaid of the *Bread*, That 'tis his *Body*, and of the *Win*, That 'twas his *Blood*, it muſt be concluded therefore that Jeſus Chriſt ſaid of the *Bread* and *Wine*, That they were his *Body* and *Cyprian.* *Tom. 9. Tract. 2. & Tract. 16.* *De Euch. l. 1 c. 11.*

AGE iii.

and *Blood*, that is to say, That the *Bread* and *Wine* were his *Body* and *Blood* in *Figure*, both the one and the other being *represented* and *signified* by the *Bread* and *Wine*. And therefore in his Epistle to *Cecilius*, where at large he proves the *Wine* must be mingled with *Water*, he saith, *If there be no Wine in the Cup, the Blood of Jesus Christ cannot be represented to us, because 'tis the Wine that represents to us the Blood of Jesus Christ.* And again, *Vini ubique mentio est, & ideo ponitur ut Domini Sanguis Vino intelligatur.* He saith of the Water, that, *Sola Christi sanguinem non potest exprimere.* In *aqua vidimus populum intelligi, in Vino ostendi Sanguinem Christi.* So that seeing St. *Cyprian* saith, That the *Wine* represenieth, *expresseth*, *sheweth*, and makes us *see* the *Blood* of *Jesus Christ*, as the *Water* represenieth, *expresseth*, and *shews* us the *Christian People*, it cannot be imagin'd that St. *Cyprian* believed the *Wine* was destroy'd, but on the contrary, he believed that after Consecration, the *Wine remained*, and that 'twas *true Wine* that he called his *Blood*, according to what he saith in the same Letter, *Quia in parte invenimus Calicem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit, & vinum fuisse quod Sanguinem suum dixit.*

AGE iv.

That the Fathers of the Fourth Century *did not believe* Transubstantiation.

Eustathius.

Nicæn. Syn. 2. Act. 6.

EUstathius, Patriarch of *Antioch*, upon these words of *Solomon* in the *Proverbs*, *Eat my Bread, and drink the Wine which I have prepar'd*; saith, *That the wise Man by the* Bread *and* Wine *did foreshew the Anti types of the Body of Jesus Christ*: Now that which is a *Type*, is an *Image*; what is an *Image* cannot be the *thing* but in *Figure*: so that the *Bread* is not destroy'd, because it is the *Type* and the *Image*.

Eusebius Lib. 8. de Dem. Evang.

Eusebius of *Cæsarea*, interpreting these words of *Genesis*, Chap. 49. Vers. 12. *His Eyes shall be red with Wine, and his Teeth*

PAGE IV.

Teeth white with Milk, saith, *That the first words signifie the Joy that the mystical Wine doth cause in the Disciples of Jesus Christ when he saith to them, Take, Drink ye ALL of this*, &c. *And these words, The Teeth white with Milk, do signifie the purity and cleanness of the Mystical Food, which are the Symbols which Jesus Christ left to his Disciples, commanding them to celebrate the Image of his proper Body; not requiring any more bloody Sacrifices, and commanded to make use of Bread for the Symbol of his Body.* *Eusebius.*

Seeing then that according to this ancient Doctor, the *Wine* is the *Symbol* of the *Blood* of Christ, and the *Bread* the *Figure* of his *Body*, and both the one and the other an *Image* of the *Body* and *Blood*, the *Image* is not that of which 'tis an *Image*; and by consequence, in the *Eucharist*, besides the *Body* of *Jesus Christ*, there is also *Bread* and *Wine*, which do *represent* and *shew* him; it being evident by the Text of this Author, that he understood the words of Jesus Christ, *This is my Body*, in this sense, *This is the Symbol of my Body.*

Cyril of *Jerusalem* saith, *Quemadmodum Panis Eucharisticus post Spiritus Sancti invocationem, non amplius est Panis communis, sed est Corpus Christi, sic & sanctum hoc unguentum non amplius est unguentum illud.* *Cyril. us Hierosol. Catech. Myst. 3.*

Macharius, a noted Hermite in *Egypt*, who wrote his Homilies about the year 368. saith in the 27th Homily, *That before the birth of Jesus Christ, the wise Men, Holy Men, Kings and Prophets, knew that Jesus Christ was to come to be a redeemer, but they knew not that he was to suffer death, that he was to be Crucify'd, and that he should shed his Blood on the Cross, and that they had not attain'd so far as to know there should be a Baptism of Fire and of the Holy Ghost, and that in the Church should be offered Bread and Wine, Antitypes of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and that those which eat of this visible Bread, should spiritually eat the Flesh of the Lord.* This Father saying that the *Antitype* of the *Flesh* and *Blood* of *Jesus Christ* is *Bread* and *Wine*, doth suppose the *Bread* remains, as not being the *Real Body* of Jesus Christ, but a *Type* of it: now the *Type* is not the verity, *sed umbra veritatis*, saith St. *Ambrose*, de fide l. 3. c. 8. and by consequence, there is in the *Eucharist* something else besides the *Body* it self of *Macharius.*

Jesus

AGE iv.

Jesus Christ. And when he saith, That those which take the *visible Bread, do spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ*, he gives us sufficiently to understand, that in this august Sacrament, there is besides the *Flesh* of Jesus Christ a *visible Bread*, and that the *visible Bread* is eaten *corporally*, and the *Flesh* of Jesus Christ *spiritually*.

Macharius.

S. Basil Ep. 289.

S. *Basil*, Bishop of *Cæsaria*, in his Epistle to *Cæsarea*, saith, *That at* Alexandria, *and in* Ægypt, *each Lay-person for the most part, kept the Eucharist by them, and communicated themselves when they pleased; and if they receive from the Priest a morsel of the consecrated Bread, they may receive the Holy Sacrament daily if they list, taking some of it to day, and the rest to morrow. For*, saith, he, *the Priest in the Church gives a good Piece or morsel of the Eucharist, and he that takes it, doth communicate himself at his pleasure. Now*, saith he, *as to the validity and virtue of the Sacrament, it is one and the same, whether one receives one morsel, or two, of the Priest.* In what sense can it be understood that one receives several parts or *parcels* in the *Eucharist*? It cannot be meant of Jesus Christ, whose *Body* cannot be divided into morsels; it must therefore be understood, that S. *Basil* believed that the *Bread* remained in the *Eucharist* as a *Typical* and *Symbolical Body of* Jesus Christ.

Ephrem.

Ephrem Deacon of the Church of *Edessa*, contemporary with S. *Basil*, and whose Writings St. *Jerom* reports in his Catalogue, were read in the Church after the Holy Scriptures; he saith, in the Treatise he wrote, *That Men should not search too curiously into the Nature of God; consider diligently* (saith this holy Deacon) *how Jesus Christ taking the Bread into his hands, blessed and broke it as a Figure of his immaculate Body; and taking the Cup, he blessed it as a Type of his blessed Blood, and gave it to his Disciples.* It is evident that *Ephrem* believed the *Bread* is the *figure* of the *Body*, and the *Wine* the *Type* of the *Blood* of *Christ*; *figura autem non est veritas, sed imitatio veritatis, saith S. Gaudentius* upon *Exodus*, Tract. 2. the *Body* of Jesus Christ is the *verity*, there must then be in the Sacrament, besides the *real Body*, a *material* and *Typical Body*, which may be the *figure* of the *true Body* of Jesus Christ.

S. *Epipha-*

AGE IV.

S. *Epiphanius* having said, That Jesus Christ descended into the Waters to be Baptis'd, not to receive any virtue from the Waters, but to confer it upon them, he adds, That 'tis in Jesus Christ the Prophecy of *Esay* is accomplished, who in the third Chap. speaks of the vertue of *Bread* and *Water*, he gave strength to the Waters, *illuminans eas, & roborans in Typo earum quæ in ipso erant perficiendæ*; and as for the Bread, *Cibus quidem panis est, sed virtus in eo est ad vivificationem.* S. *Epiphanius* speaks here of the *Eucharist* as he doth of *Baptism*, he saith, That both one and the other receive their virtue from Jesus Christ, who communicates to them spiritual strength, sufficient to sanctify; now as the *Water* of Baptism is changed only by a change of virtue, and quality, it is apparent S. *Epiphanius* did not mean that the *Bread* of the *Eucharist* should be destroy'd, no more than the *Water* was in Baptism; else he would not have said, that the Consecrated *Bread* was a food, for *accidents* cannot nourish, nothing can be fed by that which is not a *Body*; nourishment proceeds from a substance or matter, saith *Aristotle*, and *Boetius. in Predic.* saith, that 'tis impossible an accident should pass into the nature of a substance, *ut accidens in substantiæ naturam transeat fieri nullo modo potest.*

Epiphanius.

S. Ep. in Compend. de fide Eccles. Deus ad aquas descendit.

Incorporea re nihil augetur. Arist. de generat. & corrupt. *Alimentum vel materiam partim. ibid. l. 2.*

Gregory Nazianzen, speaking of the miraculous recovery of his Sister *Gorgonia*, speaks in these terms, *pouring forth a Flood of tears after the example of her that washed Christ's feet with her tears, she said, she would not depart thence till she had recover'd her health, her tears were the perfume which she spread over all his Body, she mingled them with the Antitypes, or the Symbols of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, as much at least as she could hold in her hands, and immediately, O the Miracle, she found her self healed.* And in his seventeenth Oration, this godly Prelate interceding to the Emperor's Prefect, that he would extend his favour, and no deliver up the City to be plundred, *I set before your Eyes the Table where we jointly receive the Sacrament, and the figure of my Salvation, which I consecrate with the same Mouth wherewith I make my request to you, this Sacrament, I say, which lifts us up to Heaven.*

Greg. Naz. Orat. 11.

PAGE iv.

Gregory Nazianz.

It appears by these words, that S. *Gregory* lookt upon the Consecrated *Bread* and *Wine* as *figures* of the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ: now if they are figures, then they are not that whereof they be figures, and by consequence, there is in the Sacrament something else besides the *very Body* of Jesus Christ, to wit, the *Bread* and *Wine*, which are the *Types* and *figures* of it. For to say that S. *Gregory* means only that the *accidents* of *Bread* and *Wine* are the *Types* and *figures*, when he saith, his Sister *mingled her tears with the Antitypes of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, as many as she could keep in her hands*, *Si quid Antityporum pretiosi Corporis aut Sanguinis manus thesaurisasset*, these words, *as many as she could gather in her hands*, signify, as many portions and parts of the Eucharist as she could gather up, *paululum Eucharistiæ*, as *Eusebius* speaks in the sixth Book of his Hist. chap. 36. as having gather'd together a little of the Sacrament, and having separated it from a greater Mass, or from a greater quantity of liquor. Now all antiquity agree, that the *lines*, the *superficies*, the *qualities*, are inseparable from their *subject*, so that this little parcel of *Antitypes*, this parcel of the *figures*, cannot be a part of *accidents*, and of *appearances*.

Greg. Nyss. In his Oration of the Baptis. of J. C.

Gregory Nyssen going to prove that the *Water* of Baptism, for being *Water*, ought not to be despised, but that after Consecration it hath a marvellous Virtue, he proves it by the Example of the *Eucharist*, and *extream Unction*. "*The Bread*, saith he, "*before Consecration is but common Bread, but after Consecration* "*it is called, and is the Body of Christ*; *so also the Mystical Oyl*, "*and Wine, before Benediction, are common things, and of no* "*virtue, but after Benediction, both of them have a great virtue.* Now these words shew, that the *Bread* and *Wine* remain after Consecration; for it appears that St. *Gregory*'s Design is to prove, that common and ordinary things have a marvellous force after *Consecration*, and if the *Bread* and *Wine* were destroy'd after *Consecration*, what did operate would not be a vile and mean thing, because it would be the *very Body* of Jesus Christ, and St. *Gregory* would not well have proved that vile things have any marvellous virtue in them after *Consecration*; for instance, *Bread* and *Wine*, which not subsisting after Consecration, could not have the virtue to sanctify.

S. *Ambrose*

AGE iv.

S. *Ambrose* in his Epistle to *Justus*, explaining what *Somer* is, saith, it is a measure, and that this measure signifies the quantity of Wine which rejoyces the heart of Man; and having explain'd the Wine, of the drinking Wisdom, Sobriety, and Temperance, he saith, *That it is to be understood more fully of the Blood of Jesus Christ, which neither admits increase, nor decrease, as to grace; But of which if one receive more or less, the measure however of Redemption is equal to all. Plenius de sanguine intelligitur cujus ad gratiam nihil minuitur, nihil adaugetur, & si parum sumas, & si plurimum hauris, eadem perfecta est omnibus mensura Redemptionis.* This manner of speaking of taking more or less of the *Blood* of Jesus Christ, is not to be understood of the proper *Body* of Jesus Christ, which is indivisible; there must be therefore in the Eucharist, besides the *proper Blood* of Jesus Christ, a *Typical* and *Symbolical Blood*, which is the *Wine*, which is so called, and of which we may say, we receive more or less.

S. *Ambrose* l. 1. *Ep.* 1.

The same Father saith elsewhere, *That as often as we receive the Sacraments, which by the virtue of Holy Prayer are transfigur'd into the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, we shew forth the Death of Christ.* It is certain that by these words, S. *Ambrose* lookt upon the *Bread* and *Wine* as *figures* of the *Flesh* and *Blood*; now the *figure* being a thing distinct from what it represents, as being two correlatives, the one of which is not the other, it must be concluded, that S. *Ambrose* believed that there is *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Eucharist*, which are the *figures* of the *Bread* and *Heavenly Power*.

Id. Tom. 4. *de fide* l. 4. c. 5.

The same Father speaking of the blessing of *Aser*, explaining these Words, *Ashur his Bread is fat, he shall feed Princes*; saith, *Jesus Christ who is Ashur, that is rich, has nourish'd Princes. When he multiply'd the five and seven Loaves, and gave them to his Apostles to distribute to the multitude, he every day gives us this Bread*, saith he, *when the Priest doth consecrate: we may also by this Bread understand the Lord himself* (continues S. *Ambrose*) *who has given us his Flesh to eat.* By these words it appears S. *Ambrose* distinguishes three sorts of *Bread* which Jesus Christ gave to these Princes; the first is that which he gave in multiplying the five and seven Loaves, *John* 6. and *Matth.* 15. the second is the *Bread*

Idem Tom. 1. of the blessing of the *Patriarchs*. c. 9.

AGE iv. *Ambros.*

which the Priest consecrates at *Mass*; the third is that of which it is said, *I am the Bread of Life*, which is Jesus Christ himself. As then the second is not the first, so neither is the second the third: The *Consecrated Bread* is another thing than *Jesus Christ*, the *Bread of Life*; and by consequence, there is in the Sacrament a *Bread* distinct from *Jesus Christ*, the *Heavenly Bread*.

Gaudentius. Gaud. Bishop of Brix. Tract. 2.

Gaudentius upon *Exodus* saith, *With great reason we receive with the Bread the figure of the Body of Christ, because as the Bread is compos'd of many grains, which being ground into Flower is kneaded with Water, and baked by Fire, so also the Body of Christ is made and collected of the whole race of Mankind, and is perfected by the Fire of the Holy Ghost.* Now as this Author places the figure of the Body of Jesus Christ in that the Bread is made up of sundry grains, reduced into Meal, kneaded with Water, and baked with fire: it follows, that he believed the *Bread* remained in the *Sacrament*, and so much the rather because this Bishop saith elsewhere, *figura non est veritas sed imitatio veritatis.*

Chrysostome. S. Chrys. Hom. 83. on S. Matth.

S. *Chrysostom* expounding these words, "*I will no more* "*drink of this fruit of the vine, until I drink it new in the* "*Kingdom of my Father*, saith, *because Jesus Christ had spoke* "*to his Disciples of his Passion and of his Death, now he speaks* "*to them of his Resurrection, making mention of his Kingdom,* "*calling his resurrection by this name; Now wherefore did Jesus* "*Christ drink after his Resurrection, fearing lest ignorant per-* "*sons should think his Resurrection was only imaginary, because* "*many took the act of drinking as a true sign of the Resurrection;* "*Therefore the Apostles going to prove his Resurrection, say, We that* "*have eat and drank with him, Jesus Christ. Therefore assuring* "*them that they should see him after his Resurrection, and that he* "*would stay with them, and that they might bear witness of his Re-* "*surrection, might see and behold him, tells them, I will no more* "*drink the Fruit of the Vine, until I drink it with you in a new* "*manner, whereof you shall bear testimony, for you shall see me* "*after my Resurrection; But wherefore*, continues S. Chrysostom, "*did he drink Wine after his Resurrection and not Water? it is be-* "*cause he would thereby destroy a pernitious Heresy. For because* "*there would be Hereticks that would only make use of water in* "*the Mysteries, he would represent the Mysteries; he gave Wine,*

and

AGE iv. *Chrysostom.*

"*and when, after the Resurrection, he eat his common Repast, "he drank Wine, the Fruit of the Vine; now the Vine doth produce "Wine and not Water.* This Passage marketh in the first place, That Jesus Christ drinking the *Fruit of the Vine* after his Resurrection, and not Water, he accomplish'd what he said in celebrating the Eucharist, *I will no more drink of this Fruit of the Vine, until I drink it new in my Fathers Kingdom.* This shews that Jesus Christ drank *true Wine* in the Institution of the *Eucharist*, for what is to be done again, must needs be done before. Secondly, St. *Chrysostom* doth not only say that Jesus Christ drank *Wine*, but he saith further, That he distributed *Wine* amongst his Disciples, and *the Fruit of the Vine*, which doth not produce *Water* but *Wine*. So that these words of St. *Chrysostom* import clearly, That the *Wine* remains in the *Eucharist*.

The same *Father* on these words of the First to the *Corinthians, The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* (speaks thus) *What is the Bread? it is the Body of Jesus Christ. What becomes of them which receive it? they become the Body of Jesus Christ.* Now this Proposition, *The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ*, cannot be in a Literal Sense, for saith *Vasquez*, *The Bread without a Figure, cannot be called the Body of Jesus Christ, nor the Body of Jesus Christ be called Bread.* *Idem in Hom. 24.*

The same *Father* in his Commentary upon the Epistle to the *Galatians*, Chap. 5. explaining these words of the Apostle, *The Flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the Flesh*; The *Manicheans* understood by the *Flesh*, the *substance of the Body*, and by the *Spirit* they understood the *Soul*; and they said, That the Apostle cut Man into two, and intimated, that Man was compos'd of two contrary Substances, one bad, which was the Flesh; and the other good, which was the Spirit, which proceeded from the good God, and the Body from the bad God.——S. *Chrysostom* answers, That the Apostle in this place doth not call the Flesh the Body, *Apostolum non hic carnem appellare Corpus*, as the *Manicheans* supposed, and saith, That the Apostle do's not always mean by the *Flesh*, the *nature of the Body*, *Naturam Corporis*, but that very often by the

Flesh,

AGE iv. *Chrysostom.*

Flesh, he means something else, as *evil Desires*; and having proved this by sundry passages of the Apostle, and other holy Writers, he proves it at last by the example of the *Eucharist*, and of the Church, which, he saith, is called Body in the Holy Scriptures; he saith farther, That the Scripture is wont to call by the name of *Flesh*, as well the *Church*, as the *Mysteries*, saying, It is his Body, *Rursum Carnis vocabulo Scriptura solet appellare tum Mysteria tum totam Ecclesiam, dicens eam Christi Corpus esse.* It appears by these words of St. *Chrysostom*'s, That he did not believe that the Consecrated *Bread* and *Wine* were the same with the *Body* of *Christ*, seeing he proves by the *Eucharist*, that the *Consecrated Bread* and *Wine* are called *Flesh*; and that the Word *Flesh* in this place, is taken for something else besides *Body*, and that he puts the Term *Flesh*, given to the *Consecrated Bread* and *Wine*, which are the *Mysteries*, in the rank of other Terms of Flesh given to *evil Desires*, and to the *Church*, which are *mystical* and *figurative* Terms. So St. *Chrysostom* believed the *Bread* and *Wine* remained, and are so called the *Body* of Jesus Christ *mystically*, as the *Church is* called the *Body* of Jesus Christ.

The same St. *Chrysostom* wrote a Letter to *Cæsarius*, which indeed is not inserted in his Works, but is found in Manuscript in the Library at *Florence*, and it was also found in *England* in *Archbishop Cranmer*'s Library, it is mention'd in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Printed at *Collen*, 1618. in this *Bibliotheque*, Tom. 4. there is found the Collections of an ancient nameless Author, who wrote against the *Severian*, and *Acephalian* Hereticks, wherein is recited a Passage taken out of this Letter. So also Monsieur *de Marca* Arch-Bishop of *Paris*, acknowledges the truth of this Letter in his *Posthume* and *French* Treatise of the *Eucharist*, witness the Abbot *Fagget* in his Letter to Monsieur *de Marca*, President of the Parliament at *Pau*, who saith also this Letter was found by Monsieur *Bigot* in a Library at *Florence*. St. *Chrysostom* in this Letter writeth against *Apollinarius*, and saith, "*Jesus Christ is both God and Man,* "*God because of his Impassibility, Man by his Passion, one Son,*

"*one*

AGE IV. *Chrysostom.*

" *one Lord, both Natures united making but one, the same Power,* " *the same Dominion; although they be two different Natures,* " *each conserves its own Nature, because they are two, and yet* " *without confusion; for as the Bread before it is sanctified, is* " *called Bread, when by the intercession of the Priest, Divine* " *Grace has sanctified it, it loses the name of Bread, and be-* " *comes worthy to be called the Body of Jesus Christ, al-* " *though the Nature of Bread abides in it, so that they are* " *not two Bodies, but one sole Body of the Son; so the Di-* " *vine Nature being united to the Humane Nature of Jesus* " *Christ, it did not make two Persons, but one only Person and* " *one Son.*

St. *Chrysostom* saith plainly, That the *Nature* of *Bread* abideth after *Consecration*; and this Father's Argument would be of no validity, if this *nature* of the *Bread* was nothing but in shew, for *Apollinarius* might have made another opposite Argument, and say, That indeed it might be said there were two *Natures* in Jesus Christ, but that the Humane *Nature* was only in appearance, as the *Bread* in the *Eucharist* is but in *shew*, and hath only outward and visible qualities remaining in it, whereby it is term'd to be *Bread*.

This Author gives under S. *Chrysostom's* Name.

The Author of the imperfect Work upon St. *Matthew* written in the time of the Emperour *Theodosius*, did not believe *Transubstantiation*, when he spake in these Terms in Homily Eleventh, *If it be dangerous to employ the holy Vessels about common uses, wherein the* true Body *of Jesus Christ is not contain'd, but* the Mysteries *of his* Body; *how much rather the Vessels of our Bodies, which God has prepared to dwell in.*

That

AGE V. That the Fathers of the FIFTH CENTURY did not believe Transubstantiation.

S. Jerom. S. *Jerom* in his Epistle to *Eustachium* speaking of Virgins, saith, That when they were reproved for Drunkenness, they excus'd themselves by adding Sacrilege to Drunkenness, saying, *God forbid that I should abstain from the Blood of the Lord.*

It appears by these words, that they imply the common belief, that there was true Wine in the Eucharist; because they say, That should they abstain from Wine, they must abstain also from the Blood of the Lord.

In the Second Book against *Jovinian* it is said, *The Lord in the Type of his Blood, did not offer Water, but Wine.* These words are indeed *Jovinian's*, but St. *Jerom* finds no fault with them. For he himself saith the same, upon the 31 Chapter of *Jeremy*, Vers. 12. on these Words, *They run after Gods Creatures, the Wheat, the Wine, and the Oyl, the Bread, and the Wine*, saith he, *whereof is made the Bread of the Lord, and wherein is accomplished the Type of his Blood.* Now saith St. *Ambrose* *, *The Type is not the Truth, but it is the shadow of the Truth.* There must then be in the Eucharist, *Bread*, and *Wine*, distinct from the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ, to be the *Types* and *Figures* of it.

* *De fide l. 2. c. 5.*

The same Father in his Letter to *Hedibia*, *Let us hear, that the Bread which the Lord broke, and gave his Disciples was the Lord's own Body, saying, Take, Eat, This is my Body*; and a little after he saith, *If the Bread that came down from Heaven is the Body of the Lord, and the Wine which he distributed among his Disciples his Blood*, &c.

St. *Jerom* saith, That Jesus Christ brake and distributed *Bread* to his Disciples, that he gave them *Bread*, and that the *Bread* and *Wine* were his *Flesh* and *Blood.* It cannot then be said, That what Jesus Christ gave in communicating his Disciples was not *Bread* and *Wine*; and when he saith, both the one and the other was his *Body* and *Blood*, it cannot be understood but only *figuratively*; for we see above in St. *Cyprian*,

prian, that the Jesuites *Salmeron* and *Bellarmine*, do confess, That if Jesus Christ said of the Bread, *This is my Body*, it must be meant, *This Bread is the Figure of my Body*, the one not being capable of being the other but *figuratively*: And the Reason is given by *Vasquez*, when he saith, *If the Pronoun, This, in the words of Consecration be understood of the Bread, undoubtedly by virtue of it, there can be wrought no Transubstantiation, because of necessity the Bread must needs remain*; *Si Pronomen hoc in illis verbis demonstraret panem, fatemur fore ut nulla conversio virtute illorum fieri posset, quia panis de quo enunciatur manere debeat.* AGE v. St. Jerom.

The same S. *Jerom* in his Commentary upon the 26 Chapter of St. *Matthew*, saith, *Jesus Christ having eaten the Paschal Lamb, took Bread which strengthens the Heart of Man, and proceeded to the accomplishment of the Sacrament of the true Passover, that as Melchisedeck had offered Bread and Wine in Figure, he also himself would represent the truth of his Body.*

According to this Father, the *Bread* and *Wine*, represent the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ, and therefore are not *properly* and *truly* the *Flesh* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ, but are something else besides them, and by consequence remain in the Sacrament. For to say, as the Author of the Second Book of the *perpetuity of the Faith of the Eucharist* doth against Monsieur *Claude*, that St. *Jerom* means by *representing*, to make a thing be *present*, we before refuted this Fancy, in *Tertullian*, who speaks just as St. *Jerom*: And the terms sufficiently declare, that St. *Jerom*'s meaning is, That Jesus Christ made use of *Bread* and *Wine*, to *signifie* and *shew forth* his *Body* and *Blood*, as *Melchisedeck* had done, that is to say, as he had *represented* both the one and the other by the Oblation of *Bread* and *Wine*.

St. *Austin* in his Sermon to the newly Baptized, which it's true is not found in his other Works, but was preserv'd and is cited by "St. *Fulgentius de Baptismo Æthiop.* Cap. 7. "*What* "*you see*, saith he, *upon the Altar of God, you saw also the last* "*Night, but you were not yet aware of how great a thing it is a* "*Sacrament*; *That which you see is Bread, and a Cup of Wine,* "*and it is also what your Eyes declare unto you*; *but what your* "*Faith should instruct you in, is, That the Bread is the Body of* "*Jesus Christ, and the Cup his Blood. If you tell me, Jesus Christ* "*is born, he was crucified, he was buried, he rose again, and is* "*ascended into Heaven, whither he has carry'd his Body, and is* St. Austin.

PAGE v.

St. Austin.

" *at present on the right hand of God, from whence he shall come to* " *judge the quick and the dead, how then can the Bread be his Body,* " *and the Cup his Blood? these things, my Brethren, are called Sacra-* " *ments, because one thing is seen in them, and another thing is under-* " *stood by them? what is seen hath a Corporeal Substance; what is* " *understood hath a Spiritual Fruit. If then you desire to understand* " *what the Body of Jesus Christ is, hearken to the Apostle which* " *saith, You are the Body of Christ and his Members: If then you* " *are the Body of Jesus Christ and his Members, it is the Mystery* " *of what you are, which is upon the Holy Table, it is the Mystery* " *of the Lord, which you receive; in saying* Amen, *you answer* " *and subscribe to what you are. All you that are united in Charity,* " *you make but one Body of Jesus Christ, of which you are the* " *Members, which is what is signified by the Bread compos'd of* " *several Grains, and by the Wine which is made of sundry Grapes.* " *For as Bread to be made a visible Species of Bread, is made of* " *sundry Grains collected together in one, and the Wine,* &c.

St. Austin.

St. *Austin* saith, That the *Bread* is the *Body* of *Christ*, which cannot be but *improperly* and *figuratively*, as hath been shewed above; for by Confession of *Roman Catholick* Doctors, every Proposition that saith of the *Bread*, That it is the *Body*, must needs be *typical* and *figurative*.

He saith what is *seen* is *Bread*, as our Eyes declare to us; now what our Eyes report to us is true *Bread*, as when one says, What you see is *true Gold*, and *Silver*, or *Marble*, and 'tis what your *Eyes testifie*, that is to say, That one sees *true Gold*, and *true Marble*, and that one makes use of their *Eyes* to confirm it.

In the same sense he saith; That Jesus Christ although in Heaven, yet the *Bread* is the *Body*, and the *Wine* the *Blood*, because they are the *Sacraments* of it.

He saith, What one sees hath a *bodily species*; now in this Passage, by *bodily species*, he means the *very Substance*, and not the *Accidents*. For he saith afterwards, speaking of *Bread* in general, as *Bread* to be a visible *species of Bread*, must be made of several Grains reduced into one lump; now by the *species of Bread*, it is plain, St. *Austin* there means *true Bread*, and a *true Substance*.

He saith, What you *see*, is *Bread*, and a *Cup*; now by *Cup*, he doth not mean the *appearance of a Cup*, he means a *true Cup*. He saith this *Bread* is the *Mystery* of the Lord. Which is nothing else, but that 'tis the *Figure of the Lord*, as when he saith, This

Bread

Bread is the *Myſtery of Believers. Myſterium veſtrum in Menſa Domini accipitis.* That is to ſay, That the *Bread* and *Wine* are the *Figure* of Jeſus Chriſt, as they are the *Myſtical Body* of Jeſus Chriſt. To conclude, St. *Auſtin* ſaith, The Faith of the New-baptized was to be ſtrengthened; it was therefore here the proper place for him to have ſaid, That the *Bread* was no more *Bread*, that the *Wine* was no longer *Wine*, but that there remained only the *Accidents* of the one and the other. St. *Auſtin.*

The ſame Holy Father anſwering Biſhop *Boniface*, who deſired to know how it might be ſaid of an Infant newly Baptis'd, he hath *Faith*, he *Believes*, who is incapable of believing, and of whom no aſſurance can be given what he will be afterwards; he ſaith, "*That as every Sunday, and Eaſter Day, is called Eaſter, and the Reſurrection, although the Lords Eaſter, and Reſurrection, are things hapened ſeveral Ages paſt; ſo it may be ſaid, An Infant hath Faith, becauſe he hath the Sacrament of Faith. For, ſaith he, if the Sacraments had not ſome reſemblance with the things whereof they are Sacraments, they would be no Sacraments; as therefore in ſome ſort the Sacrament of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt is the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Sacrament of his Blood, is the Blood of Chriſt, ſo alſo the Sacrament of Faith, is Faith; now to believe, is nothing elſe but to have Faith.* *Ep.* 23. *ad Boniſ.*

He ſaith, The *Euchariſt* is called *Fleſh* and *Blood*, becauſe it is both the one and the other in ſome ſort: now according to St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, *What is not truly that by the name by which it is called, is but figuratively or improperly that by the name whereof it is called.* Now that the *Bread* and *Wine* which are the Sacraments of the *Body* and *Blood* of Jeſus Chriſt, are his *Body* and *Blood* in ſome ſort, *ſecundum quendam modum*, it follows, The *Bread* and *Wine* are not *properly* the *Fleſh* and *Blood*, and by conſequence, are not *Tranſubſtantiated.* Moreover St. *Auſtin* doth explain the *Manner* according to which the *Euchariſt* is the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, and he ſhews it, by reaſon that generally the *ſigns* are called by the name of the *things* they *ſignifie*, not that they *are* the *things* they *ſignifie*, but becauſe they are the *ſigns*, and that they have ſome *reſemblance* to them. *De Opiſ. l.* 1. *c.* 15. *Quod non per omnia eſt id quod eſſe dicitur, illud abſive appellationem illam habet.*

The ſame Father upon the third *Pſalm*, admires the Patience of Jeſus Chriſt that bore the Treachery of *Judas* to the end, although he was not ignorant of his Thoughts, and admitted him to the Banquet, at which, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, Jeſus Chriſt

AGE v.

recommended and gave to his Disciples, the *Figure* or *Type* of his *Flesh* and *Blood*, *Cum adhibuit ad convivium, in quo Corporis & Sanguinis sui Figuram Discipulis commendavit & tradidit.* *Now the Figure is not the Truth, but the Imitation of the Verity, saith* Gaudentius *in Exod. Tractatu* 2. Moreover, St. *Austin* cannot find in the Scriptures, that Jesus Christ in instituting the Sacrament, gave to his Disciples the *Figure* of his *Body* and *Blood*, but in these words, *Take, Eat, This is my Body, This is my Blood*, he must then understand these words of the Institution, in a figurative sense. And according to the same Doctor, a * *Sign is that which shews it self to the Senses, and besides that shews something else to the Mind*; It must then follow, That the Sign is a thing which remains, to shew it self.

St. *Austin.*

* *De Princip. Dialect. l.* 5. *Signum est quod seipsum sensibus, & præter se aliquid animo ostendit.*

The same Father disputing against *Adimantus* the *Manichean*, Chap. 12. and against the Adversary of the Law and the Prophets, in the Second Book, Cap. 6. who said, The *Blood* is the *Soul*, as is said, *Deuteronom.* 12. and by consequence, that Men killed the *Soul* when they shed *Blood*. S. *Austin* replies, That this Precept in *Deuteronomy*, That *Blood* must not be eat, because 'tis the *Soul*, is a Precept that must be understood as many other things contained in the Scriptures, which are to be taken in *Types*, and *Figures*, *Illud præceptum positum esse dicimus sicut alia multa & pene omnia Scripturarum illarum Sacramenta signis & figuris plena sunt.* And concludes towards the end of that Chapter, That the *Blood* is the *Soul*, as the *Rock* was *Christ*, *Sanguis est Anima quomodo petra erat Christus.* And upon *Leviticus*, *Quest.* 54. *The thing which signifies, is wont to be called by the name of the thing signified, as 'tis written, the Rock was Christ: For 'tis not said, The Rock signifi'd Christ, but as if it were that which indeed it was not in substance, but only in signification.* And as in the beginning of the Chapter he saith, *That it must be understood in the Sign, Jesus Christ making no difficulty to say, This is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body. Sanguis est Anima, præceptum illud est in signo positum, non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, Hoc est Corpus meum, cum daret signum Corporis sui.* Seeing then St. *Austin* doth say, That the *Blood* is the *Soul*, as the *Rock* was Christ; and as the *Eucharist* is the *Sign* of Jesus Christ, he must of necessity have understood the Words of Institution of the Sacrament, in a figurative

tive sense; and that so much the rather, because this manner of speech, *Jesus Christ made no difficulty*, plainly shews, that Jesus Christ did not speak in a *proper* but in a *figurative sense*, as *Fulgentius* saith, *Although the Apostle saith, That Jesus Christ is the Head of the Body of the Church, nevertheless he makes no Scruple to call Jesus Christ the Church, which is his Body.*

S Austin. Ad Monym. l. 2. c. 10. cum Electionis Vas dicat quia Christus caput est corporis Ecclesiæ, ipsum tamen corpus Christi non dubitat Christus veraciter appellare.

This manner of speech is never used in *proper* expressions: no Body will say, Jesus Christ made *no difficulty* to give *Gold*, or *Water*, if it were *true Gold* or *Water* which he gave.

The same holy *Doctor* saith in several places after the Apostle, That the *Bread* in the Sacrament after Consecration, is *broken*, and *distributed*; and he doth very well recommend this breaking the Bread, as being a great mystery. In his Epistle to *Paulinus*, he saith, *In that Jesus Christ was known by the two Disciples in breaking the Bread, no body ought to question but this breaking was the Sacrament whereby Jesus Christ brings us all to the knowledge of his Person.* A little before he saith; *By the* Prayers, *we mean those which are said before one begins to bless what is upon the Lords Table. The Prayers* are said when that which is on the Lords Table is blessed, sanctifyed, and distributed. In his Epistle to *Casulanus* he saith of S. *Paul*, that in the night time he went *to break Bread*, as it is broken in the *Sacrament* of his *Body*. In his Commentary upon the first Ep. of S. *John*, It was very reasonable that Jesus Christ recommending his Flesh, *broke Bread*, and it was very just that the Disciples knew him in *breaking of Bread.*

Ad Paulin. Ep 59. Ep. 86. Tract. 2.

In the 140. Sermon *de temp:* and in the Hom. Of the consent of Evangelists, lib. 3. c. 25. and *de diversis*, Serm. 87. he saith, *Where would Jesus Christ be known? In the breaking of Bread. We are then secure; we break Bread, and we know the Lord.* If then after consecration we *break Bread* to distribute, then of necessity the *Bread* must remain: for to say that 'tis the *accidents* which are *broken*, and *distributed*, S. *Austin* doth say the contrary, when he affirms, that one *breaks* and *distributes* what is on the Table, being *blessed* and *sanctify'd*. Now to *bless* and *sanctify*, one shall never find to have signifi'd to *destroy*, and *change the substance.*

The same Doctor in several places does always call the Eucharist, *the Sacrament of Bread and Wine*, he saith, S. *Paul* doth teach the unity of the Church in the *Sacrament of* Bread, when he saith, *We are all one Bread, and one Body.* In the questions

De consensu Evangelist. l. 3. c. 25.

AGE v.

S *Augustin.* *l.* 1. *q.* 43. *l.* 20. *c.* 13.

questions upon the Evangelists, he saith, *Jesus Christ by the Sacrament of Wine, recommends his Blood.* In his Books against, *Faustus, we are very far from doing what the Heathens did for their Gods,* Ceres *and* Bacchus, *although we have a ceremony of celebrating the Sacrament of Bread and Wine. Now to what end were it to call the Eucharist a Sacrament of Bread and Wine,* if there did not remain *Bread* and *Wine* after *Consecration*? for what means this manner of speech, the *Sacrament* of *Bread* and *Wine*, but the *Bread* and *Wine* which is the *Sacrament*? As when the Apostle saith, Rom. 4. v. 11. *the sign of Circumcision.* What else doth this import, but the *Circumcision* which is the *sign*? When *Tertullian de Baptismo*, calls Baptism *Sacramentum aquæ nostræ*: What else can that mean, but our *Water* which is a *Sacrament*? When S. *Austin* upon S. *John* Tract. 11. saith, The *figure* of the *Sea*, *figura Maris* What more can this signify, but the *Sea* which is the *figure*? When it is frequently said, the *Sacrament of the Eucharist*, what else can that import, but the *Eucharist* which is a *Sacrament*?

Penè quidem Sacramentum omnes corpus ejus dicunt.

The same Father in his 52 Sermon, *de verbis Domini*, saith, *almost all do call the Sacrament the Body of Jesus Christ.* Now if the *Bread* were the *real Body* of Jesus Christ, wherefore should S. *Austin* observe that all called it the *Body* of Jesus Christ? For one cannot make such a remark, but when one saith of a thing, that 'tis that which properly it is not. It would be ridiculous to say, almost all call *Lewis* 14. King; & the reason is, because 'tis not strange that persons should be called by their names: but on the contrary, it is very strange, to call one by a name that doth not at all belong to him.

The same *Father* in his 26. Treatise upon S. *John*, going to shew upon these words of the Apostle, *They did all eat the same Spiritual meat, and drink the same Spiritual drink*: *The* relation and difference there is betwixt the Sacraments of the old and new Testament, saith, *The Fathers did eat the same spiritual food as we do, not the same corporal food as we do; because they did eat Manna, and as for us, we eat something else; They drank the same spiritual drink we do, the same as to the signification, but different as to visible and outward kind.* And upon S. *John*, Treatise 45. *If you consider the visible species, it was another drink, if you consider what was signify'd by their drink, and ours, it was one and the same thing. Si speciem visibilem intendas aliud est, si intelligibilem significationem, eundem potum spiritualem biberunt.*

And

AGE v.

S. Auſtin.

And upon the 77. Pſalm, *Their food was the very ſame with ours, the ſame as to what it ſignify'd, but different in kind. Idem in myſterio cibus illorum qui noſter; Sed ſignificatione idem, non ſpecie.* This reaſoning does intimate, That the Fathers under the old Teſtament did, and we now do eat a corporal food, and that we drink a corporal liquor. Now by this corporal meat and drink, we muſt underſtand either the *accidents* of *Bread* and *Wine*, or the *Body* and *Blood* of Jeſus Chriſt, or the *Bread* and *Wine it ſelf*. It cannot be ſpoken of the firſt, becauſe the *accidents* of Bread and Wine are only *qualities*, or *dimenſions*; now *qualities* and *dimenſions* are not *corporal*. The *quality* is ſomething which is *incorporeal*, ſaith *Nemeſius*, of the Soul; as concerning *dimenſions*, S. *Auſtin de geneſi ad literam*, ſaith, *We call that a Body which taketh up ſome ſpace by its length, by its breadth, and by its depth.* *Nemeſius* gives the reaſon of it, *becauſe*, ſaith he, *nothing that is immaterial is a Body, for all Bodies are material.* There being nothing material then in the Euchariſt, as is ſuppos'd, there being nothing that takes up place, that is large or long, or deep; There is nothing corporeal in the Sacrament, and by conſequence, nothing that can be termed corporal meat or drink. Moreover, when Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaks of corporal nouriſhment and drink in the Euchariſt, as the Fathers under the old Teſtament had done, he ſpeaks of bodily meat and drink, S. *Auſtin* did not underſtand the corporal meat and drink ſpoke of by the Fathers of the old Teſtament, to be only the *accidents* of one and the other, ſo that S. *Auſtin* ſpeaking in the ſame terms of bodily meat and drink, in relation to that of the Antients, he did not mean meer accidents or qualities. The *Body of Jeſus Chriſt* nor his *Blood*, cannot be this corporal nouriſhment which S. *Auſtin* compares to that of the Fathers under the Law: for by bodily meat and drink which he ſaith we receive in the *Euchariſt*, he means a viſible ſubject, *aliud illi, aliud nos, ſed ſpecie viſibili, ſi ſpeciem viſibilem intendas, aliud eſt.* It remains then that in S. *Auſtin*'s ſenſe, we underſtand by the *corporal nature* of the Euchariſt the *viſible Bread*, the *viſible Wine*, and not their *qualities* and *accidents*.

The ſame Father in the third Book of the Trin. cap. 10. ſpeaking of things that are taken to ſignify, ſaith, *a thing is taken to ſignify, either after ſuch a manner, as that the thing ſhould ſubſiſt and remain ſome time, as did the Brazen Serpent, lift up in the*

AGE v.

St. Austin.

the Wilderness, or as do the letters of the Alphabet, or in such a manner as the thing taken to signify is not to subsist any long time, but is to pass away and be destroy'd when the thing 'tis to represent is passed away; as the Bread of the Sacrament, which being taken to signify passeth away and is consumed in receiving the Sacrament. S. *Austin* there saith, That the Bread of the Sacrament which is taken to signify, passeth and is consumed in receiving the Sacrament; Now if the Bread be destroyed and Transubstantiated by these words, *This is my Body*, then it passeth not away, and is not consumed in the act of receiving.

The same Doctor in the seventeenth *Of the City of God* saith, *To eat Bread, is in the New Testament the sacrifice of Christians*; and against the Enemy of the Law. l. 7. c. 20. *Those*, saith he, *which read know what Melchisedeck offered where he blessed Abraham, and those which are partakers, see that the like sacrifice is now offer'd through all the World.* How is it that the Sacrifice of Christians, is to *eat Bread*, if the *Bread* do not remain? How is it that communicating, one is partaker of what *Melchisedeck* offer'd, if in communicating, one do not receive neither *Bread*, nor *Wine*?

The same Father in the third Book against *Parmenian*, reproving the *Donatists* for forsaking the Church, tells them, S. *Cyprian*, and the other Bishops, did not separate themselves because they would not communicate with covetous persons, and Usurers; *but that on the contrary, they did eat with them the Bread of the Lord, and drank his Cup.* This passage sheweth, that when S. *Austin* said to the new Baptised, as hath been shewn, that the *Bread* is the *Body* of Jesus Christ, it could not be understood but *figuratively*: for here the *Bread* is said to be of the *Lord*; now saith S. *Athanasius*, that which is another's is not that other himself, to whom it belongs. *Id quod alicujus est, non idipsum est cujus est.* And S. *Austin* elsewhere distinguisheth betwixt the *Bread* which belongs to the Lord, and the *Bread* which is the Lord. Speaking of *Judas* and the other Apostles, he saith of the Apostles, they ate the *Bread* which was the Lord; and of *Judas*, He did eat the *Bread of the Lord* against the Lord; they ate life, he Death; for 'tis said by S. *Paul*, That he which *eateth unworthily, eateth his own judgment and condemnation.* Seeing then that the Eucharist is distinguish'd from the Lord, it necessarily follows, That *Bread* remains in the Sacrament after Consecration.

In Joan. Tract. 59.

The

AGE v. *S. Auguſtin.*

The ſame Father in his 33 Sermon of the Words of our Lord, ſaith, *'The Lord gave to his Diſciples the Bleſſed Sacrament with his 'own hands, but we were not at the Banquet; nevertheleſs by faith we 'daily eat the ſame Supper; and do not think that it had been any great 'advantage to have been preſent at that Supper that he gave with his 'own hands to his Diſciples, without Faith; Faith afterwards was of 'greater advantage than treachery was then; St.* Paul *who believed, 'was not there preſent, and* Judas *who betray'd his Maſter, was pre-'ſent. How many be there now that come to the Communion, that al-'though they did not ſee that Table, and though they never ſaw with 'their Eyes, nor taſted with their Palate, the Bread which the Lord 'held in his hands, nevertheleſs, becauſe the ſame Supper is ſtill prepa-'red, do there eat and drink their own damnation?* It plainly appears, That the *Bread* which St. *Auſtin* ſaith our Saviour had in his hands during the *Sacrament*, was *true Bread*, becauſe St. *Auſtin* ſaith, that thoſe who at preſent participate of the Sacrament, do not *Taſt*, nor *Eat* the *Bread* which our Saviour held in his hands, and which he diſtributed, and of which the Diſciples did formerly eat.

The ſame Father teaching that the Good might participate of the Divine Sacraments with the Wicked, ſaith, Judas *and* Peter *had each of them a part of the ſame Bread, which they received at the ſame hand of the Lord; and nevertheleſs what ſociety or likeneſs was there betwixt* Peter *and* Judas? *In the* 7th chap. *the wicked and the good bear the ſame Word of God, do partake of the ſame Sacraments, and eat the ſame holy nouriſhment.* Now what is this holy Food? What is this *Bread*, whereof one receives one Portion, and another, another Part? Are they *Accidents?* But *Accidents* are neither *Bread* nor *Food*. It is not the *real Body* of Jeſus Chriſt, for it cannot be received by Parcels; it muſt then be *true Bread* which remains after Conſecration, and which is, as is ſaid before, *Bleſſed, Sanctified*, and *Broke* in Pieces on the Holy Table to be diſtributed. *Benedicitur, & Sanctificatur, & ad diſtribuendum comminuitur.*

Lib. Con. Donat. c. 6. de ipſo quippe Pane, de ipſa Dominica Manu, &c.

Ep. 59.

The ſame Doctor in *Ep.* 120, ſpeaking of the Rich in oppoſition to the Poor, of whom it is ſaid, That *they ſhall eat and be ſatisfied. Theſe Rich Perſons*, ſaith St. *Auſtin, have been brought to the Lords Table, and receive from his hand his Body and Blood, but they only adore, and are not ſatisfied.* For juſt as St. *Ambroſe* diſtinguiſheth betwixt drinking the Wine, *Vinum bibere*; and drinking *of* the Wine, *de Vino bibere*; that is to ſay, to taſt of a little Wine, *de ejus portione libare*; ſo alſo St. *Auſtin* his Diſciple, diſtinguiſheth betwixt

Et ipſi quidem adducti ſunt ad Menſam Chriſti, &c.

De Noe & Arca. c. 29.

AGE V. betwixt receiving the *Body* and *Blood* of the Lord, *accipere Corpus & Sanguinem Domini*, and to receive *of the Body* and *Blood* of the Lord, *Accipere de Corpore & Sanguine Chriſti.* St. *Auſtin* explains himſelf more fully, when he ſaith in his 86*th Ep.* That one receives in the Euchariſt a Portion of the *Body* of the immaculate Lamb, *De Agni immaculati Corpore partem ſumere*: And in the 35*th* Sermon on the Words of our Lord, he ſaith, *In receiving the Sacrament, we know what we ſhould think of, we receive a little, and we are fatned in the heart, modulum accipimus & in corde ſaginamur.* Now that cannot be underſtood of the *proper Body* of Jeſus Chriſt, which cannot be received by Parcels; therefore it muſt be meant of *Bread*, which is the *Figure* of his *Body*, or the *Sacrament* of it. It is what St. *Auſtin* intends, when he ſaith, *Nec quando manducamus* (when we eat Jeſus Chriſt) *de illo partes facimus; equidem in Sacramento ſic fit.* We do not make Morſels, but it is done in Sacrament, that is to ſay, That we break and divide the *Sign* and the *Bread*, which is the Sacrament.

S. *Auguſtine.*

The ſame Father ſaying that the *Accidents* cannot in any wiſe ſubſiſt without their *Subject*, ſaith in his 2*d* Book of Soliloquies, chap. 12. *What can reconcile what you demand? or who can think it poſſible to be done, that that which is in a ſubject ſhould remain, the ſubject it ſelf ceaſing to be? For 'tis a thing monſtrous, and very far from the truth, that that which doth not ſubſiſt, if it be not in a ſubject, can be, the ſubject it ſelf not remaining.* Alſo in the 13*th* chap. 10*th* Book, and in the Book of the Immortality of the Soul, *ch.* 5. *The ſubject being changed, of neceſſity all that was in the ſubject muſt be changed.* In the 8th chap. *What is not of it ſelf, if it be abandoned by that by which it is, muſt undoubtedly ceaſe to be.* Alſo in the 10*th chap.* and in the Book of Categories, ſpeaking of *Accidents*, *A colour cannot be without a ſubject.* And in the Epiſtle to *Dardanus*, *Take away the bodies from the qualities of bodies, they will have no place to remain in, and by conſequence it is neceſſary that they cannot be.* And againſt *Julian*, chap. 5. *It's true*, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, *that the things that are in a ſubject as the qualities are, cannot be without the ſubject wherein they are, as the colour or form*, &c. It's impoſſible, had St. *Auſtin* believed that the *Bread* did not remain in the *Euchariſt* after Conſecration, that he ſhould have eſteemed that abſurd and ridiculous which happened every day. It alſo ſeems that St *Auſtin* had been too wide, when he doubts in the 146*th Ep.* to *Conſentius*; Whether Jeſus Chriſt has *Blood*, when he ſaith on the 98*th* Pſalm,

Pſalm, *You ſhall not eat this Body which you ſee, nor ſhall drink this Blood, which thoſe that ſhall crucify me ſhall ſhed, I have given you a Sacrament*, &c. And in the 20th Book againſt *Fauſtus*, *The Fleſh and Blood of this Sacrifice was promiſed by Sacrifices of reſemblance before the coming of Jeſus Chriſt; It was given by the verity in the Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt; after the Aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, it is celebrated by the Sacrament of Commemoration.* AGE V. S. *Auguſtine.*

To conclude, St *Auſtin* in his 33*d* Sermon on *the Words of our Lord*, having ſaid, as hath been ſeen before, That of things which are put to ſignify, there are ſome that are to remain, others to be deſtroy'd, when the Miniſtry of their ſignification is accompliſh'd; as the *Bread* of the Sacrament; he adds, *But becauſe theſe things are obvious to men, as being practis'd by men, they may deſerve our veneration, as being Holy and Religious things; but they cannot cauſe any wonder in us, as if they were miraculous.* Certainly if St. *Auſtin* had held *Tranſubſtantiation*, as it comprehends many things repugnant to Natural Reaſon, which are ſo many aſtoniſhing Miracles, St. *Auſtin* could not have ſaid, That the Sacraments, wherein he includes that of the *Euchariſt*, have ſomething in them that deſerves our *reſpect and veneration*; but have nothing that deſerves our *aſtoniſhment and admiration.*

Theſe are ſome of the Reaſons which made Monſieur *De Marca*, Archbiſhop of *Paris*, Predeceſſor to him that with ſo much reputation now fills the chiefeſt See of *France*, ſay, That the Catholick Doctors are to blame, when they pretend that St. *Auſtin* expounded the Text of the Inſtitution of the *Euchariſt*, as it is done in the Schools. And a little before; that in St. *Auſtin*'s Divinity, *This is my Body*, ſhould be expounded in this manner, *This Bread is the ſign and Sacrament of my Body*: For according to St. *Auſtin*, ſaith Monſieur *De Marca*, The *Bread*, to ſpeak properly, is but the *ſign* and *Sacrament* of the *Body*, to which Jeſus Chriſt made no ſcruple to give the name of the thing ſignified. It is alſo the judgment of *Tertullian*, when he ſaith, *When Jeſus Chriſt ſaid, this is my Body, That is to ſay, this is the figure of my Body*; and ſaith Monſieur *De Marca*, The reaſons that are given to the contrary, are not ſatisfactory. *French.* Poſthum. Treatiſe of the Euch.

Bullenger writing againſt *Caſaubon*, recites this paſſage of *Theodoret*, who was a Prieſt at *Antioch*, in the year 411. *As the King*, ſaith he, *and his Image are not two Kings; ſo alſo the perſonal Body of Jeſus Chriſt, which Body is in the Heavens, and the Bread which is* *Theodoret.*

AGE v.

his Antitype, and is distributed to Believers by the Priest, are not two Bodies. It appears by this comparison, that *Theodoret* did believe the *Bread* of the Eucharist is something else besides the *Body* of Christ; and by consequence, he believed that there remained *true Bread* in the Sacrament, and not *Bread* in *shew* and *appearance* only.

Theodoret.

Theodoret, who in the year 423 was *Bishop* of *Cyrus*, doth so fully explain himself hereupon, that there is no doubt to be made of his Opinion, *He was pleas'd*, saith he, *that those who participated of the Divine Mysteries, should not have any regard to the nature of the things that are seen; but that they should believe by the change of Names, the change that is made by Grace: For having called his* Body, Wheat *and* Bread, *and having called himself a* Vine, *he honours the* visible Symboles *with the name of his* Body *and* Blood, *not in changing their* Nature, *but in adding* Grace *to their* Nature. He could not more fully express that he did not hold *Transubstantiation.*

Dial. 1.

Arnobius *junior.*

Arnobius the younger, who wrote in the year 431. upon the 4th *Psalm* saith, speaking of the Sacrament, *We have received Wheat in the Body, Wine in the Blood, and Oil in the Chrism.* On the 22*d Psalm*, and on the 51*st*, and 54th *Psalms*; Let us see what the Church keepeth; She hath a Table, from which she gives *Bread* to Believers; she hath *Oil*, wherewith she refresheth the Head, *in libertatem conscientiæ præsumenti*, &c.

Accipimus frumentum, &c.

Quod nunc habeat intra se Ecclesia videamus, &c.

On *Psalm* 103. We receive *Bread* because it strengthens the Body; we receive *Wine*, because it rejoyces the Heart; and having received double comfort in the Heart, our Faces are made shine by the Oil of Chrism. To conclude, on *Psalm* 104. he saith these words, speaking of the Lord, *That the Lord in the Eucharist gives us the species of Bread and Wine, as he doth the species of Oil in Baptism*; which cannot be understood of appearances and *Accidents*, as the terms of *species of Oil* cannot be taken for the *Accidents* and appearances of *Oil*. Moreover, he observes we receive in the Eucharist *Bread* and *Wine*, as we receive *Oil* in the Holy *Chrism*; Now in the *Holy Chrism*, it is true *Oil* that we receive; *Arnobius* then could not reason so, if he believed *Transubstantiation.*

Accipimus pinem quod confirmat, &c.

Exurgens a Mortuis, &c.

Prosper.

The Author of the Books of the *Promises and Predictions of God*, attributed to St. *Prosper* by *Cassiodorus*, and which were written about the year 450, under the Empire of *Valentinian* the 3*d*, relates a History of a young unchast Girl that was possessed with the Devil, who in Communicating, had received a little morsel of the Lord's

Lords Body, which the Prieſt had moiſtned; it was half an hour before ſhe could ſwallow it down, till ſuch time as the Prieſt touched her throat with the Chalice; then ſhe cried out inſtantly that ſhe was healed. After which, Prayers being made for her, ſhe received a portion of the Sacrifice, and was reſtor'd to her former health. Theſe terms *of ſome portion of the Sacrifice*, and of a little *part* of the moiſtned *Body* of the Lord by the Prieſt, cannot be underſtood of the *true Body* of Jeſus Chriſt; of neceſſity then the *Bread* by this Author muſt be called by the name of the *Body* of Jeſus Chriſt; and by conſequence he believed it remained in the Sacrament after Conſecration.

Proſper.

Heſychius, one of the Prieſts of the Church of *Jeruſalem*, in the year 480, ſaith in the ſecond Book on *Leviticus*, *ch.* 8. *This Myſtery* (ſpeaking of the *Euchariſt*) *is at once Bread and Fleſh*, *Illud Myſterium ſimul panis & caro.* In this ſame place he ſaith, it was the cuſtom of the Church of *Jeruſalem* in his time, to burn what remained after the Communion.

Heſychius.

Procopius of *Gaza*, who in all likelihood wrote in the end of the fifth Century, expounding theſe words of *Geneſis*, where *Jacob* ſaith of *Juda*, *His eyes be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk*, *&c.* applying them to our Bleſſed Saviour in the Myſtery of the Sacrament, ſaith, *that 'tis a metaphor taken from thoſe that having drank, are the merrier for it*, *&c.* and ſaith that the holy Scriptures would denote the gladneſs which the Lord left to his Diſciples in giving them the *Myſtical Wine* by the words of Inſtitution, *Take, drink ye all of this: Theſe words*, ſaith he, *do ſhew that Jeſus Chriſt doth with mercy look on all thoſe that believe in him, becauſe 'tis the nature of wine to make every one merry.* And upon theſe words, *his teeth are white as milk*; *milk*, ſaith he, *doth denote to us the whiteneſs and purity of the myſtical nouriſhment*; *for Jeſus Chriſt gave to his Diſciples the Image of his true Body*; *not deſiring any of the bloody ſacrifices of the Law, he would by the white teeth, ſignifie to us the purity of the food wherewith we are nouriſhed*; *for according to holy* David, *Sacrifice and burnt-offerings thou wouldeſt not, but a Body haſt thou prepared me.*

Procopius Gazæus.

When *Procopius* ſpeaketh of the *Myſtical Wine* that rejoyced the Diſciples, it being the nature of *Wine* to *make merry*; this *Myſtical Wine* is not the *Blood* of Jeſus Chriſt, for 'tis not the nature of *Blood* to rejoyce. It muſt therefore be meant, that *Procopius* ſaid, by the *Wine* which Jeſus Chriſt diſtributed to his Diſciples, was to be underſtood

AGE V.

derſtood *true Wine*; and by the *whiteneſs* of the *Myſtical food*, he meant the whiteneſs of the *Bread* which is both food and Image, which cannot be underſtood of the *true Body* of Jeſus Chriſt, which is neither the *Image* of himſelf, nor *bodily food*; nor of the accidents, which cannot nouriſh the Body, becauſe nouriſhment proceedeth from matter.

Procopius.

The ſame *Procopius* in his Commentary on *Eſay*, expounding theſe words of the Prophet, *Chap.* 3. *The Lord of Hoſts will take away from Judah and Jeruſalem the ſtaff of Bread and Water*; ſaith, that in the firſt place theſe words of the Prophet may be underſtood of Jeſus Chriſt, and of his *Fleſh* and *Blood*. The *Bread* being to be underſtood of him of whom *David* ſaith, *He gave them bread from Heaven*; and the waters, of thoſe of which Jeſus Chriſt ſaid to the *Samaritan*, *Whoſoever drinketh of this water, it ſhall be a fountain flowing unto everlaſting Life*. Then he adds, *There is another bread which giveth life to the world, which was taken from the Jews; and another water, which is that of Baptiſm.* Now by this *other bread* which was taken from the *Jews*, he means that of the *Euchariſt*; and whereas he diſtinguiſhes it from the *bread*, which is the *Lord*, as he diſtinguiſheth the *water* of Baptiſm from that which was given to the *Samaritan*; it follows, that the *Bread* of the *Euchariſt* is ſomething that is diſtinguiſht from Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, the *Bread* of Heaven.

P. Gelaſius.

Gelaſius Biſhop of *Rome*, in the year 492, wrote a Treatiſe of the *two Natures* againſt *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*, and he excludes *Tranſubſtantiation*, when he ſaith, *that the ſubſtance or nature of Bread and Wine doth ſtill remain.*

Reſp. 1. *ad* 2 *Interrog. Ferr.*

This Work is aſſuredly of Pope *Gelaſius*, as is confeſſed by Cardinal *Du Perron*, becauſe firſt *Fulgentius* cites four paſſages of this Treatiſe as being writ by Pope *Gelaſius*. And Pope *John* the Second in *Epiſt. ad Amænum*, alſo cites ſome paſſages of this Work, as being writ by *Gelaſius*; and though he doth not give him the Title of Pope, 'tis becauſe his name was well enough known at *Rome* when *John* the Second lived.

That

AGE VI.

That the Fathers of the SIXTH CENTURY *did not believe* Transubstantiation.

SAint *Fulgentius* saith, *The Catholick church doth continually offer to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, a Sacrifice of Bread and Wine throughout all the World. For in the fleshly Sacrifices of the* Old Testament, *there is a type of the Flesh of Jesus Christ, which he was to offer without spot for our Sins; but in this Sacrifice, there is a Thanksgiving and Commemoration of the same Flesh, which he offer'd for us, and of the Blood which he shed for us.* He saith, That this Sacrifice consists in offering *Bread* and *Wine*; there must then be *true Bread* and *Wine* in this Sacrifice to be offer'd. *Fulgentius. De fide ad Pet. Diac. c.* 19.

Ephrem de *Conte*, of the *East*, made Bishop of *Antioch*, in the Year 526. wrote Books, which he intitled *Sacred Laws*, in the first of which disputing against the *Eutychians*, he saith, When our Fathers said, That Jesus Christ is compos'd of two *Natures*, they meant two *Substances*, as by two *Substances* two *Natures*. *No body of any sense, but may say, that the Nature of that which is to be felt, and not felt in Jesus Christ, is the same Nature. Thus it is, that the body of Jesus Christ, which is received by believers, doth not quit its sensible Nature, and remains without being separated from the intelligible Grace.* The which he confirms by the Example of *Water*, which doth not lose its Nature by *Consecration*. This Argument is of the same kind of that we see of *Theodoret*, and of *Gelasius*, whereby these three Authors prove, that in the *Incarnation*, the presence of the *Word* did not destroy the *human Nature* in Jesus Christ, as the presence of the *Holy Ghost* doth not destroy the *Substance* of *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Eucharist*. We may say of this Triple and same Argument, *Funiculus triplex difficile rumpitur.* Monsr. de *Marca*, saith in reference to this passage, and of those we have instanced in of *Theodoret*, and St. *Chrysostom*, that these three Authors have owned a real change of the *bread*, which nevertheless leaves the *Species* in their *natural Substance*. *Ephrem. Apud. Pho. Bibl. cod* 223. Eccles. 4. v. 12.

Facundus Bishop of *Hermiana* in *Africa*, in the year 552. whose Books, which he wrote in Defence of the *Three Chapters* of the Council of *Chalcedon*, are justly praised by *Victor* of *Tunes* in his Chronology, and by St. *Isidore* of *Sevil*, and which Father *Sirmond* the Jesuit *Facundus. Lib.* 9. *De viris illustribus, c.* 18.

AGE. vi.

Jeſuit got out of the *Vatican* Library; going about to excuſe *Theodore* de *Mopſueſt*, who taught that Jeſus Chriſt had taken the Adoption of the Children of God; from whence it might have been concluded, that he believed that Jeſus Chriſt is only an adoptive Son, ſaith, *Baptiſm, which is the Sacrament of Adoption, may be called Adoption, as we call the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, which is in the conſecrated Bread and Wine, his Body and Blood; not that the Bread is properly his Body, and the Cup his Blood; but, becauſe they contain in them the Myſtery of his Body and Blood. Therefore, as the faithful Servants of Jeſus Chriſt, receiving the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, are very rightly ſaid to receive his Body and Blood; ſo alſo Jeſus Chriſt having received the Sacrament of the Adoption of Children, might very well be ſaid to have received the Adoption of Children.*

Facundus.

Lib. 9.

Certainly, if the Sacrament of *Bread* and *Wine* is not *properly* the *Body* of Jeſus Chriſt, as *Facundus* ſaith, but barely *Body* and *Blood*, as *Baptiſm* is *Adoption*; the *Bread* and *Wine* are not *Tranſubſtantiated* into the Euchariſt, and are but ſimple ſigns, and ſomething that is diſtinguiſhed from the *Body* and *Blood* of Jeſus Chriſt.

Primaſius.

Primaſius Biſhop of *Adrumetum* in *Africa*, in his Commentary upon the 10*th* Chapter of the 1*ſt* to the *Corinth.* ſaith, *As the Bread which we break, is the Participation of the body of Chriſt, ſo alſo the Bread of Idols, is the Participation of Devils.* Now as the Participation of the Bread of Idols, is no *Tranſubſtantiation*, or real change into Devils; ſo alſo the Participation of the Bread of the Lord, is not a *real* and *ſubſtantial change* of *Bread* into the *Body* of the Lord.

The ſame *Doctor*, on the words of the 11*th* Chap. of the ſame Epiſtle, where 'tis ſaid, *That the Lord took Bread the night in which he was betrayed*, relates, *That Jeſus Chriſt thereby gave to us the commemoration of his Body.* And on the following words, *The Lord*, ſaith he, *hath given us an Example, to the end that as often as we do this, we ſhould think in our minds, that Chriſt died for us. It is for this end, that 'tis ſaid to us*, the Body of Chriſt, *that ſo thinking of it, we ſhould not be ungrateful and unthankful for his Grace. As if any one at his Death, ſhould leave to his Friend a pledg of his Love, could he, when he ſaw it refrain from Tears, if he really loved his Friend?* There muſt therefore needs be in the Sacrament *Bread* and *Wine* to be Pledges of Jeſus Chriſt, for he cannot be a pledg of himſelf.

The

That the Fathers of the SEVENTH *and* EIGHTH CENTURY's *did not believe* Transubstantiation.

Isidorus Hispalensis. Orig. l. 6. c. 19.

I*Sidore* Bishop of *Sevil*, *Anno* 600. saith, That by the command of Jesus Christ himself, we do call *Body* and *Blood*, that which being the fruits of the Earth, is sanctified and made a Sacrament by the invisible Operation of the Holy Ghost. In the *1st* Book of Ecclesiastical Offices, he saith, '*That the Bread is called the Body of Jesus Christ, because it strengthens the Body, and that the Wine is called his Blood, because it increaseth Blood in the Body; and that the Bread and Wine are two visible things, which being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, do go on to be the Sacrament of the Divine body.* Now a *Sacrament* signifies a *holy Sign.* It would therefore be a strange kind of way of *Isidore*, if he had believ'd the *Bread* and *Wine* were *transubstantiated*, to say, the *Bread* and *Wine* are two things visible, which being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, do become the Sacraments of the Divine body. By this Language it might as well be said, That the Fathers believed that the *Water* of Baptism was *transubstantiated* after their Consecration.

In Alleg. Vet. Test.

The same Bishop saith, *Melchisedeck*, that offer'd of the Fruits of the Earth a Sacrifice to God, thereby represented the Priesthood or Reign of Jesus Christ, which is the true King of Peace, *of whose Body and Blood, that is to say, the oblation of Bread and Wine, is offer'd throughout the World.* And in the Treatise *De Vocat. Gentium*, cap. 26. *These are not any longer Jewish Sacrifices, such as were offer'd by* Aaron *the Priest, which are now offer'd by Believers, but they are such Sacrifices as were presented by* Melchisedeck *King of* Salem, *that is to say, it is Bread and Wine, the true Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.* He saith, The *Sacrament* of the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ is *Bread* and *Wine*, That both the one and the other are such Sacrifices as those offer'd by *Melchisedeck*; there is therefore no question, but St. *Isidore* did not believe that the *Bread* was destroy'd in the Sacrament, because he establishes the Sacrament in the *Bread* and *Wine*, such as *Melchisedeck* had offer'd.

AGE viii.

Beda.

In Lucæ 22. & in Marc. 14. & in Hom quadrages. Feria 3o. palmarum.

Beda, an English Priest saith, *That Jesus Christ having ended the Ceremony of the Ancient Passover, which was celebrated in commemoration of the Bondage in* Egypt, *out of which the* Jews *had been deliver'd, proceeded to the new Passover, which the Church celebrates in remembrance of His Redemption, the* figure of *his Body; to the end, that instead of the Flesh and Blood of the Lamb, substituting the Sacrament of his Flesh and Blood in the* figure of *Bread and Wine, he might shew that it was him to whom God had sworn, and repented not, saying, Thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedeck.* Now, continues *Beda*, *Jesus Christ broke the Bread which he distributed to his Disciples, to shew, That the breaking of his Body did not come to pass without his good will.* It appears from these words, (*substituting the Sacrament of his Flesh and Blood in the figure of Bread and Wine*) that the *Bread* and *Wine* remain after Consecration, to be the figure of the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ. As when the Apostle saith, the sign of Circumcision, *signum circumcisionis*; That is to say, Circumcision which is a sign and a figure. So *Beda* maketh the Sacrament consist in the *Bread* and *Wine*. Therefore in the Homily, *De Sanctis in Epiphania*, he saith, *That Jesus Christ the Heavenly Lamb, having been offer'd up, and transfer'd into the creatures of Bread and VVine, the Mystery of his Passion, and thereby became a Priest for ever after the Order of* Melchisedeck. And elsewhere he saith, Melchisedeck *Priest of the most high God, did long before the time of the legal Priesthood, offer up Bread and VVine.* Therefore our Saviour is called Priest after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, because *he abrogated the Sacrifices of the Law, and instituted a Sacrifice of the same kind to be under the New Testament, the Mystery of his Body and Blood.* Certainly, As our Mystery is no Mystery till after Consecration; and that 'tis of the same Nature as was that of *Melchisedeck*, it must be concluded, that the *Bread* and *VVine* do remain in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

Rom. 4. 11.

Hom. 1st. &c. 55 in Virg. St. Joan. Bapt.

Sedulius.

Sedulius, a *Scotchman*, Author of the Commentaries upon St. *Paul*, and who flourished about the year 735, in his Commentary upon the first to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 11. saith, *Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, hath left us the remembrance of himself, as if one going a far journey should leave with his friend the pledg of his love, to remember their ancient amity.* There must then needs be something that is not Jesus Christ himself, for no one is a pledg of himself.

Jo. Damascen.

Damascen a Frier, who lived about the year 750, saith in his fourth Book of Orthodox Law, *Chap.* 14. *The Shew-bread did typifie this*

this Bread, and 'tis this pure and unbloody Sacrifice which our Saviour foretold by the Prophet, should be offered to him from the rising of the Sun to the setting of the same, to wit, the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which passeth into the substance of our Body and Soul, without being consumed, without being corrupted, without going into the draft, God forbid, but passing into our substance for our preservation. Now every body agrees this cannot be said of the proper Body of Jesus Christ. It must then be concluded, *Damascen* supposed that the *Bread remained.* AGE viii. *Damascen.*

In the same place he adds, *That as in Baptism, because men are wont to wash with water, and anoint them with oyl, God has added to the water and oyl, the Grace of his Holy Spirit, and has made it the washing of Regeneration; so also, they being accustom'd to eat bread, and to drink wine and water, he has joined them to his Divinity, and has made them his Body and Blood.*

In the same place, *The Prophet Esay saw a light coal; now the Coal is not of meer wood, but it is joined to fire; so also the Bread of the Eucharist is not common bread, but it is united to the Divinity, and the Body which is united to the Divinity, is not one and the same Nature, but the Nature of the Body is one, and that of the Divinity, which is united to it, is another.*

In the same place, *How is it that the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Wine and Water his Blood? he answers, The Holy Ghost comes and disposes these things after such a manner as surpasseth our thoughts and expressions.* The *Bread* and *Wine* are taken, *Panis & Vinum assumuntur*, in Greek παραλαμβάνεται, a word used by St. *Athanasius* to express the *Hypostatical Union.* Now these kinds of expressions of *Damascen* do imply, that the *Bread* and *Wine* do remain in the Sacrament.

The *Council* of *Constantinople* composed of 338 Bishops, held in the viiith *Century*, for regulating the business of *Image-Worship*, having condemn'd their use, they would by the way explain the Doctrine of the Church touching the *Eucharist*, and to draw a proof against those very Images, they call it the true Image of Jesus Christ; they say he gave it to his Disciples to be a Type of the evident Commemoration of his Death; they say that Jesus Christ chose no other Species under Heaven, nor no other Type that should express his Incarnation. Behold then, say they, *the Image of his quickned Body, which was made after a precious and honourable manner.* They affirm, that as the Word did not take a Person, *Concil. Constant.* Act. 6.

AGE viii. *Conc. Const.*

that so the addition of a Person might not be made to the Divinity; so also he appointed, that an Image should be offered, which is a chosen matter, to wit, the *Substance* of *Bread*, that has not the figure of Man, to avoid giving occasion of Idolatry; As then, say they, the Body of Jesus Christ which is according to Nature, is Holy, as having been Deified; so also 'tis apparent, that that body also that is by Institution, is Holy, and it's Image is Holy, as having been Deified by Grace, by a kind of Sanctification. They maintain, that as the Human Nature was Deified by its Union with the Word, so also the *Bread* of the Sacrament, as the true Image of the Natural Flesh of Jesus Christ, is sanctified by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and becomes the Body of Jesus Christ, *because the Priest transfers the Oblation from the state of a common thing, to something that is holy.* To conclude, they clearly distinguish the natural Flesh of Jesus Christ, which is living and intelligent, from his Image, which is the Heavenly Bread, filled with the Holy Spirit. All these continued Expressions are so far from any Idea of *Transubstantiation*, that one must needs see, that the *destruction of the Bread and Wine* in the Sacrament, was not believed by the Fathers of the Council, nor by the Church in their time.

Alcuinus.

Ep. 69.

Alcuin speaking of the Consecrating of Bread and Wine to be the Body and Blood of Christ, saith, that the Sanctification of this Mystery doth foreshew to us the effect of our Salvation: *That by the Water is signified the Christian People; by the grains of the Wheat ground into Meal to make Bread, is meant the Union of the Universal Church, which is made one Body by the fire of the Holy Ghost, which unites the Members to the Head; and that by the Wine is shewed the Blood of the Passion of the Lord.* Doubtless *Alcuin* did not believe *Transubstantiation*, seeing he places in the *Bread* and *Wine*, the signification of the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ; and that he saith by the *Wine* is shewed the *Blood* of Jesus Christ; for that which is a Figure, and that which is figured; that which sheweth, and that which is shewed, are two different things, the one of which is not the other. Therefore the same *Alcuin* doth formally distinguish the Eucharist from the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ, when he saith after St. *Austin*, *Whosoever abideth not in Jesus Christ, and he in whom Christ abideth not, doubtless doth not spiritually eat his flesh, altho he visibly and carnally eats with his teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.*

In Joan. c. 13. v. 15.

Charles

Charles the great, his Disciple, writing to the same *Alcuin*, calls the Eucharist, *the Figure of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* The Lord, saith he, being at Supper with his Disciples, broke *Bread*, and gave likewise the *Cup*, *in figure of his Body and Blood*; and by this means offered us a very profitable Sacrament: Now whatever he said of the *figure* it contain'd, or that it contain'd not the truth, the figure was never the same as the thing is that's figured.

AGE VIII.

Carol. M. De Offic. Septuag. ad Alcuin.

In the *Ambrosian* Office which was abolish'd in the year 796, there was this Clause, which is still to be seen in the 4*th* Book of St. *Ambrose* his Sacraments, *Nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura Corporis & Sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.*

Ambrosian Office.

The Ancient *Roman* Order doth frequently call the *Bread* and *Wine*, the *Body* and *Blood* of the Lord; but it sufficiently shews by these manner of expressions, that it doth not mean that the *Bread* and *Wine* are the same thing with the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ; for in the first place it saith, that the Sub-Deacons when they see the Chalice wherein is the *Blood* of the Lord cover'd with a Cloth, and when the Priest hath said these words at the end of the Lords Prayer, *libera nos a malo*, they should go from the Altar, and prepare Chalices and clean Cloths to receive the *Body* of the Lord, *fearing lest it should fall to the ground, and crumble to dust.* Now who doth not see that this cannot be spoken but of the Bread, figuratively and improperly called the *Body* of Jesus Christ? 2*ly*, It saith, That the Bishop breaketh the Oblation on the right side, and that he leaveth the part which he brake, on the Altar: Now who can say that the Body of Jesus Christ can be broke into parts? 3*dly*, The Fraction being made, the *Deacon* receives from the *Sub-Deacon* the Cup, and carries it to the Chair, that the Bishop might communicate, who having communicated, puts part of the holy Oblation of which he bit a Morsel, into the *Arch-Deacons* hands. Can it be said that one doth bite the *true Body* of Jesus Christ, and that one breaks off part of it? 4*thly*, It adds, *he is to take great heed that no part of the Body and Blood of the Lord doth remain in the Chalice, or on the Plate.* By these words, the *Roman* Order gives us to understand, that it speaks of such a *Body* and *Blood* that a part of it may be separated from the whole: Now this is what can only be said of the *Bread* and *Wine*, improperly called the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.

Ordo Roman.

The

PAGE viii.

Ordo Romanus.

The now *Roman* Order at present used in the Church of *Rome*, doth also furnish us with the like reflections. It expresly marketh, That Jesus Christ gave in the Oblation, *Bread* and *Wine*, to celebrate the Mysteries of his *Body* and *Blood*. Therein is desired, That this Blessed Oblation may be accepted of God in such a manner, as that it might be made *to us* the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ; after all which, is recited the History of the Institution, and the Sacramental words. The Eucharist is called, *the Sacred Bread of Eternal Life; and the Cup, the Cup of everlasting Salvation.* To conclude, They pray God to behold those Gifts, and that he will accept them as he did the offering of *Abel*, and the Sacrifice of *Melchisedeck*, which it's very well known, was *Bread* and *Wine*. All which doth plainly shew, That the *Roman* Order at this time observed, cannot reasonably be interpreted, but in supposing that the *Bread and Wine remain in the Eucharist after Consecration.*

That the Fathers of the NINTH CENTURY *did not believe* Transubstantiation.

PAGE ix.

Theodorus Studita.

Theodorus Studita, as is related by *Michael Studita* in *Baronius*, in the year 816. N. 15. seeing himself reduced to the extremity of being starv'd, said to his Disciple, *If men are so cruel as to make me perrish with hunger, the participation of the Body and Blood of the Lord, which is the ordinary food of my Body and Soul, shall be my only nourishment:* Now the *real Body* of Jesus Christ cannot be the nourishment of the *Body*; therefore of necessity this Author must be understood to speak of *Bread*, which is his *Body figuratively* and *improperly*. It is what is also confirm'd by this *Michael Studita*, who saith in the same place, that *Theodore* had always about him, *some parcels of the quickning Body of the Lord*; which cannot be meant of the *true Body* of Jesus Christ, which is not now subject to be broken, nor divided.

Abyto.

Abyto Bishop of *Basil*, sent Ambassador by *Charlemaine* in the year 814. to *Constantinople*, to Treat a Peace with the Emperor of the East, as is declared by the Annals of *France*, by *Eginhart* Author of the Life of *Charlemaine*, the Annals of *Fulda*, *Herman Contract*, and others. This *Abyto* died in the year 836, and left a Capitulary for instruction of the Priests of his Dioces, publisht by

Dom

Dom Luke D'achery in the Sixth Tome of his *Spicilegium*, pag. 692. now amongst many other Instructions he gives his Priests in his Capitularies, this is one: 'In the fifth place, the Priest should know 'what the Sacrament of *Baptism* and *Confirmation* is, and also what 'the Mystery of the *body* and *blood* of our Lord doth mean. How a 'visible creature is seen in the same Mysteries, and is nevertheless 'the invisible. Salvation is communicated for the Souls eternal happiness, which is contained in faith only. By *visible creature*, he can only mean a creature, not in appearance, but effective, for otherwise, according to this Author, it must be said that in *Baptism*, and *Confirmation*, there should be only an apparent creature, and not the substance of *water* and *chrism*. Besides, *Ahyto* attributed the same effect to these three Sacraments, to wit, the communication of eternal and invisible salvation to them that with *faith* do receive these holy Sacraments.

AGE viii. *Ahyto.*

Theodulphus in the year 810, Bishop of *Orleans*, saith in his Treatise of the Order of Baptism, 'There *is one saving sacrifice which* Melchisedeck *also offer'd under the Old Testament, in Type of the body and* 'blood *of our Saviour, the which the Mediator of God and Man accomplished under the New, before he was crucify'd, when taking the bread* 'and *wine he blessed and gave them to his Disciples, commanding them* 'to *do those things in remembrance of him. It is this Mystery which the* 'Church *doth celebrate, having put an end to the ancient sacrifices, offering bread, because of the bread which came down from Heaven; and* 'wine, *because of him which said, I am the true Vine; to the end that by* 'the *visible Oblation of Priests, and by the invisible consecration of the* 'Holy *Ghost, the bread and wine should have the dignity of the body and* 'blood *of our Lord, with which blood there is mingled some water,* 'either *because there came out of the side of our Saviour water with* 'the *blood; Or because according to the Interpretation of our Ancestors,* 'as *Jesus Christ is signify'd by the wine, so also the people is signify'd* 'by *the water.* Now this Bishop, saying that Jesus Christ gave *bread* to his Disciples in commemoration that this Mystery is an Oblation of *visible bread* which is consecrated by the Holy Spirit, and which receiveth the dignity of the *body*; that he indifferently calls the *blood*, *wine*, and the *wine*, *blood*; that with the blood, water is mingled, and that Jesus Christ is *signify'd* by the *wine*; that 'tis said the *wine signifies* Jesus Christ, as the water doth the people; these words cannot suppose any *Transubstantiation.*

Theodulphus.

The

AGE viii.

Opposers of *Paschasius Radbertus.*

The Opposers of *Paschasius Radbertus* Frier of the Monastry of *Corby*, who wrote a Book of the *body* and *blood* of Jesus Christ, did not believe *Transubstantiation*. That the said *Paschasius* had several adversaries, appears by his own Writings, for towards the end of his Commentary upon St. *Matthew*, he saith himself, *I have inlarged upon the Lords Supper a little more than the brevity of a Commentary would permit, because there be several others that are of a different judgment touching these holy Mysteries, and that several are blind, and do not perceive that this bread and cup is nothing else but what is seen with the eyes, and tasted with the palate.* And in his Epistle to *Frudegard*, as well as in his Commentary on St. *Matthew*, ch. 12. it appears he had Opposers, because in his Epist. to *Frudegard*, he saith, *You advise with me touching a thing that many do make doubt of.* And in his Commentary, *I am told that many*, saith he, *do censure me, as if I had attributed to the words of our Lord, either more, or something quite contrary to what the genuine sense permits.* So that *Paschasius* had adversaries, and they did not believe *Transubstantiation*, because they held that in the Eucharist, *there was only the virtue of the flesh, and not the very flesh; the virtue of the blood, and not the very blood of Christ. That the Eucharist was figure, and not verity; shadow of the body, and not the body it self. They would*, saith Paschasius, *extenuate the word*, body *and perswade, Quod non sit vera caro Christi, sed quædam virtus & figura corporis Christi.* Now *Paschasius Rathbertus* was the first Author that wrote fully and seriously of the *truth* of the *body* and *blood* of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, as *Bellarmin* saith, *de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis in Paschasio Ratberto.* And Father *Sirmond* saith, he is the first that hath explain'd the sense of the Church touching this *Mystery*; so that, saith he, he hath opened the way to others, *In vitæ Ratberti præfixa ejus operibus.* Therefore it is nothing strange that *Paschasius* had enemies, and that he was accused for departing from the common Faith, and to have spread abroad Visions of a young Man: For he saith to *Frudegard*, *You have*, saith he, *at the end of this Work, the Authorities of Catholick Fathers succinctly marked, by which you may perceive, that 'twas not through rashness, that formerly when I was young, I believed these things, but by Divine authority.* He also endeavours to clear himself from this charge in alledging passages, as of Saint *Austins*, the which nevertheless are not to be found in him; as these words, *Receive in the Bread what hung on the Cross, receive in the Cup what issued out of the side of Jesus Christ.* Which is not to be found in *St. Austin.* *Raba-*

PAGE ix.

Rabanus Archbishop of *Mayance* in the year 847, stiled by *Baronius* in the year 843, No. 31. the bright Star of *Germany*, *Fulgens Germaniæ Sidus*; saith in his Institution of Clerks, *Lib.* 1. *cap.* 31. *Our Saviour liked better that believers should receive with their mouth the Sacraments of his Body and Blood, and that they should be turned into their nourishment, to the end that by the visible work the invisible effect should be shewn. For as the material food, doth materially nourish the Body, and support it, so also the VVord of God doth nourish the Soul inwardly, and doth strengthen it.* And in the same place, *The Sacrament is one thing, and the virtue of the Sacrament is another. The Sacrament is turned into the nourishment of the Body, but by the virtue of the Sacrament one acquires everlasting life. As the Sacrament therefore is turn'd into our selves, when we do eat and drink it, so also we are converted into the Body of Jesus Christ, when we live with piety and obedience.* *Rabanus.*

The same Doctor on St. *Matthew*, Chap. 26. saith with Venerable *Beda*, that Jesus Christ hath substituted instead of the flesh and blood of the Paschal Lamb, the *Sacrament of his Body and Blood.* That the Creator of the World, and the Redeemer of Mankind, *making of the very fruits of the Earth, that is to say, of Bread and VVine, a fit Mystery, turn'd it into the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, that unleavened Bread and VVine mixt with water, must be sanctified to be the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.*

Afterwards he gives the reason wherefore our Saviour chose *Bread* and *Wine* to make them Sacraments of his *Flesh* and *Blood*, and saith, that 'tis because *Melchisedeck* offer'd *Bread* and *VVine*, and that Jesus Christ being a Priest after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, he was to imitate his Oblation. And shewing the reason why the Sacrament takes the name of the *body* and *blood* of the Lord, he saith with *Isidore* Archbishop of *Sevil*, *'Tis because bread strengthens the body, it is conveniently called the body of Jesus Christ: and because wine augments blood in the flesh and veins for this reason, it is compar'd to the blood. Now both these things are visible, nevertheless being sanctify'd by the Holy Ghost, they pass into the Sacrament of the Divine body.* A Sacrament which in the 33 *chap.* he calls the *Mystical body* of Jesus Christ, in opposition to his *Natural body*, from which he distinguishes it, and draws a resemblance from the Mystical body, to the proper body of Jesus Christ. *The holy Vessels*, saith he, *are set on the Altar*, viz. *the Cup and Patten, which in some sort are the figure of the Grave of Jesus Christ, for as at that time the Body of*

AGE ix.

Rabanus.

Jesus Christ was laid in the Sepulcher, having been embalm'd by godly people; so also at present, the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, as it were imbalm'd with holy Prayers, is kept in the holy Vessels to be administred to Believers by the hands of the Ministers.

The same Doctor in his Penitential, or Letter to *Herribald* Bishop of *Auxerre*, which *Monsieur Baluze* got Printed at the end of his *Regino* at *Paris* in 1671, saith, *Chap.* 33. *As to what you demand of me, whether the Sacrament after it is eat and consum'd, and cast into the draft after the manner of all other meats, does return to the former nature it had before 'twas consecrated at the Altar; to such a needless question may be reply'd, The Lord himself said in the Gospel, that what enters into the body goes into the belly, and is cast into the draft. As for the Sacrament of the Body and blood, it is made of corporeal and visible things, but it produceth an invisible sanctification, as well to the body as to the soul. What reason is there, that that which is digested in the stomack, and is cast out into the draft, should return to its former state, there being never any that affirmed that such a thing was done? For of late some persons not having a right judgment of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, have said, that the same Body, and the same Blood of the Lord which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *and in which the Lord suffered on the Cross, and rose again from the Dead, is the same which is taken at the Altar; against which Error we have as much as was necessary written to the Abbot* Egilon, *explaining what ought truly to be believed of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist.*

Amalarius.

Amalarius, esteemed a very Learned man, in the Manuscripts cited by *Dom Luke D'achery* a Learned *Benedictin*, in his Preface to the Seventh Tome of his *Spicilegium*, was sent by the Emperor *Charles le Debonnair* to Pope *Gregory* to find out Antiphonaries, (*Amalar. in Prolog. Antiphon.*) and who by express command of the same Emperor, was chosen in a Council held at *Aix la Chappel*, *Anno* 816, to make Rules for Prebends, as is testified by *Ademar* a Monk of *Angoulisme*, in his Chronicle on the year 816, saith in his Treatise of *Church-Offices*, *Lib.* 3. *cap.* 25. That the Sacrament is to us instead of Jesus Christ. *The Priest*, saith he, *bows and recommends to God the Father, that which was offered in the room of Jesus Christ.* In the 26th chap. he saith, *The Oblation and the Cup, do signifie the Body of the Lord, when Jesus Christ said, This is the Cup of my Blood, he sanctified his Blood, which Blood was in the Body, as the Wine is in the Chalice.* In the third Book, chap. 25. he calls the

the Eucharist, *the Sacrament of Bread and Wine:* and saith, that *Jesus Christ hath in this bread recommended his Body; and in the Cup, his Blood.*

Amalarius.

The same *Amalarius* having been consulted by *Rangart* Bishop of *Noyon*, how he understood those words of Institution of the Eucharist, *This is the Cup in my Blood of the New and Eternal Testament*, with this addition which is in the Cannon of the Mass, *the Mystery of Faith*; answers him by a Letter, wherein after having spoken of the *Cup* of the *Passover*, he proceeds to that of the Eucharist; and having alledged what is mention'd by St. *Luke*, he adds, '*The* '*Cup is in type of my Body, wherein is the Blood that shall run out of* '*my side, to accomplish the ancient Law; and after it is shed, it shall* '*be the New Testament.* And a little lower he saith, '*The Mystery is* '*Faith, as St.* Austin *saith in his Letter to the Bishop* Boniface, *as the Sa-* '*crament of the Body of Jesus Christ is in some manner the Body* '*of Jesus Christ, and the Sacrament of his Blood, his Blood; so the* '*Sacrament of Faith, is Faith. So also we may say, This is the Cup* '*of my Blood of the New and Eternal Testament. As if he should* '*say, This is my Blood which is given for you.*

Amal. ad Rangart, Tom. 7. Spicilegii, pag. 166.

The same Doctor, in a Letter which he wrote to one *Gontard*, whom he calls his Son, saith, '*That it is our Saviours good pleasure* '*to shed his Blood by the Members and Veins, for our Eternal Salva-* '*tion. That 'tis a body of Jesus Christ that may be cast out in spitting* '*after having receiv'd it, and of which, a part may be flung out of* '*the mouth.* To all which he adds, *having so received the body of the* '*Lord with a good intention; I don't pretend to dispute, whether he be* '*invisibly lifted up to Heaven, or whether he remains in our Body, till* '*the day of our Death, or whether he evaporates into Air, or whether* '*he issues out of the Body with the Blood, or whether he goes out at the* '*pores; our Saviour saying, All that enters in at the Mouth, goes* '*down into the Belly, and from thence into the draft*, &c.

Now when this great Man saith, That the Sacrament is to us in the stead of Jesus Christ; that what is offered in the Eucharist is sacrific'd instead of Jesus Christ; that the *Cup* is in *Type* of the *Body*; that the *Blood* is in the *Body*, as the *Wine* is in the *Cup*; that Jesus Christ represents his *Body* by the *Bread*, and his *Blood* in the *Wine*; that the Sacrament of the *Body* is in some sort his *Body*, and that 'tis so that the *Cup* of the *Blood* is his *Blood*, that the *Body* is poured forth upon our Members for our Salvation; that there is a *Body* of Jesus Christ that may be cast out by spitting, and whereof

AGE ix.

Amalarius.

some part may be flung out of the Mouth; That he will not dispute, whether this *Body* evaporates in the Air, or whether it departs out of the *body* with the *blood*, or whether it goes out at the pores, or into the Draft; all this doth sufficiently shew, That this Doctor distinguished the *Bread and Wine*, as a *Typical body*, from the *real Body* of Jesus Christ; and that by consequence, he believed the *bread* and *wine* remained after Consecration, to be called the *body and blood* of Jesus Christ, but improperly.

Valafridus Strabo.

Lib. de Reb. Eccles. c. 16. Bill. p. 7. to. 10.

Valafridus Strabo, Abbas Augiensis, stiled a very Learned Man, by *Herman Contracted*, in the year 849. '*Jesus Christ*, said he, '*gave to his Disciples the Sacrament of his Body and Blood in the substance of bread and wine, teaching them to celebrate it in remembrance* '*of his most holy Passion, because there could nothing be found fitter* '*than these things to signify the unity of the Head and Members; for* '*as Bread is made of sundry Grains, and brought into one body by* '*means of Water; and as the Wine is squeez'd from several Grapes,* '*so also the body of Jesus Christ is made of the union of a multitude of* '*Saints.* And a little after, he declares, That '*Jesus Christ hath* '*chose for us a very fit Sacrifice, for the Mystery of his body and blood,* '*in that* Melchisedeck *having offer'd bread and wine, he gave to his* '*Children the same kinds of Sacraments.* And afterwards, *cap.* 18. That for that great Number of Legal Ordinances, Jesus Christ gave us the word of his Gospel; so also instead of the great diversity of Sacrifices, Believers are to rest satisfied, *with the sole Oblation of bread and wine.*

It is evident *Strabo* makes the Holy Sacrament to consist in the *substance of bread and wine*, which according to him, is differenced from the *body*, because it is but the *memorial* of it; That 'tis the figure, that it consists in being made of sundry Grains, and the Wine of sundry Grapes. That the Sacrifice of the *New Testament*, is of the same kind as that of *Melchisedeck*, and that the Eucharist is an Oblation of *bread* and *wine*. All these things intimate, that the *bread* and *wine* remain in the Eucharist after Consecration.

Herribald.

Tom. 2. ch. 19. 52, and 61.

Herribald was Bishop of *Auxerre*, in the time that *Vallafridus Strabo* wrote. Now he was of the same Opinion with *Rabanus*. *Thomas Waldensis* assures us so. *Herribald* of *Auxerre*, saith he, *and* Rabanus *of* Mayence *say, That the Sacrament of the Eucharist goes into the Draft.* The Anonimous Author, contemporary with *Herribald*, which was published by Father *Cellot* the Jesuit, saith also

also the same. Nevertheless *Lupus* Abbot of *Ferriers*, Ep. 19. speaking of him, calls him a *most excellent Prelate, excellentissimum Præsulem.* In the 37th Ep. he stiles him a Man of a lofty and Divine understanding, *Altissimi & Divini ingenii.* And *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Reims*, calls him the Bishop of Venerable Qualities. So that the very Chronicle of *Auxerre* intimates, that there was ingrav'd on his Monument this Inscription, *Here lies the body of St.* Herribald. Therefore the Author of the 1st Treatise of the *Perpetuity of the Eucharist*, saith in page 843, That *Herribald* and *Rhabanus*, were Adversaries to *Pascasius*: Tho in the 2d Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, in page 842. he saith, speaking of the Minister *Claude*, who told him, that *Amalarius* and *Herribald* were in any wise Adversaries to *Paschas*?

Herribald.

De Præd. ch. 6.

It appears by the Letter *Paschasius* wrote to *Frudegard*, that he was not of the same Judgment *Paschasius* was of, seeing he opposes to him St. *Austin*'s 23d Letter to *Boniface, Sic VVidefort contra VVicklisse*, ad art. 1.

Frndegardus.

* *Ratramne*, Priest and Frier of *Corby*, experienc'd in the Scriptures, equally esteem'd for his Learning and Manners, whom † *Hincmar*, ‖ *Lupus* Abbot of *Ferriers*, his Contemporaries; ∴ *Sigebert* who liv'd in the xi. Century, and Father ‡ *Cellot* the Jesuits Anonimus, do all make mention of, under his true name of *Ratramne*; wrote a Book under the Reign of *Charles* the *Bald*, as is reported by the same *Trythemius*, which he intitul'd, *Of the Body and Blood of the Lord:* From a Monk of *Corby*, he was made Abbot of *Ovais*. The President ∴ *Mauguin* speaking of him, saith, he was a Learned Doctor of the Church, eminent in Probity, and in Doctrine, an undaunted defender and protector of the Catholick Truth, against Innovators. He dedicated his Book to the Emperor *Charles* the Bald. Now this Author did not believe *Transubstantiation*, because he saith, '*For as to the substance of those Creatures, they are after* '*Consecration what they were before; they were before bread and* '*wine, and it is plainly seen, that after Consecration these created sub-* '*stances do remain in the very same species.*

Ratramnus.

* *Trithem.* de Script. Eccles.
† De Prædest.
‖ Ep. 79.
∴ De Script. Eccles.
‡ De Euchr. ch. 1.

∴ *Maug.* dissert. Hist. & Chron. c. 17. tom. 2. pag. 133 & 135.

And a little after he saith, '*This spiritual flesh which spiritually* '*feeds Believers, is made of grains of Wheat, by the hands of the Baker,*

Ratramnus in the Apology of the Fathers, Reputation of a person, Church, and

is stiled a learn'd *Benedictin* Defender of Grace, a Man of great Wisdom and and in the 1st treatise of the *Perpetuity*, p. 3. c. 5. he is stiled an obscure kind that evaporated himself in obscure Reasonings, which he added to those of the explained as he pleased himself, as some are pleased to say.

such

AGE ix.

Ratramnus.

'such as it appears to our sight; but it hath neither bones nor sinews, 'nor no distinction of parts, nor is it enliven'd with a Soul, or reasona- 'ble substance. To conclude, it is unable to move of it self, and if it 'gives life, it is the effect of a spiritual virtue, of an invisible, and a 'Divine Virtue and Efficacy. A little after he saith again, *As the* 'Water represents the People in the Sacrament, if it were true, that the 'Bread consecrated by Ministers was corporally changed into the Body of 'Jesus Christ, it must also necessarily follow, that the water which is 'mingled with it were changed into the blood of the faithful people; 'for where there is but one sanctification, there ought to be but one 'operation; and the Mystery should be equal where the Reason of the 'Mystery is the same. It is evident there is no corporal change in the 'water, and by consequence, there is no corporal change to be expected 'in the wine. All that is said of the Body of the people represented by 'water, is understood spiritually; it is then a necessary consequence, 'that what is said of the blood of Jesus Christ represented by the 'wine, must be understood spiritually. Again, The things which dif- 'fer amongst themselves, are not one and the same thing. The Body of 'Jesus Christ which was dead and rose again, and become immortal, 'doth dye no more, Death has no more dominion over it, it is Eternal, 'and can no more suffer; but that which is celebrated in the Church is 'temporal and not eternal, and it is corruptible and not incorruptible. 'And again; it must then be said, that the body of Jesus Christ, such 'as it is made in the Church, was incorruptible and eternal. Never- 'theless it cannot be denied that what is so cut into morsels to be eat, 'changed and corrupted, and that being eat with the teeth, it goes into 'the Body. Again, Now 'tis true that the figure and the reallity are 'things distinct, therefore the body and blood which are celebrated 'in the Church, are different from the flesh and blood of the body of 'Jesus Christ, which it is well known, is glorious since his Resurrection, 'therefore the body that we celebrate is a pledg and figure.

These words of *Ratramne* or *Bertram*, are so clear, that it is wonder'd the Author of the *Perpetuity* should say in the first Treatise, p. 3. that *Bertram* is an obscure Author, and not evidently favourable to *Calvinists*, but that *Catholicks* may explain him in a good sense. I cannot tell what to call this Confidence.

Joan. Erigena.

John Erigen, a Scotch Man, whom the Emperor *Charles* the Bald commanded to write touching the *Body* and *Blood* of the Lord, as he had done also to *Ratramne*, which appears by *Berenger*'s Letter to *Richard*, publish'd by *Dom Luke D'Achery* in the

2d

2*d* Tome of his Spicileg, was of an opinion contrary to *Paschasius*, as is acknowledged by * *Lanfrank*; and *Berenger* in his Epistle to the same *Lanfrank*; and *Hincmar* saith of *John Erigen*, that he taught, † *That the Sacrament of the Altar was not the real Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, but only the Remembrance both of the one and the other*: And *Berenger* writing to *Lanfranc*, saith to him, *If you hold* John *for a Heretick, whose Judgment we have been inform'd of touching the Sacrament, you must also hold for Hereticks*, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Austin, *not to mention many more.* Nevertheless * *William* of *Malmsbury*, ‖ *Roger de Hoveden*, and † *Matthew* of *Westminster*, speak of *John Scot*, as of the greatest Man of his time; and *Molanus* Professor in Divinity at the University of *Lovain*, in his Appendix to the Martyrology of *Ussuart*, at the Letter *J* has left these Words engraven, *John Scot, Martyr, translated Dionysius's Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, after which by Authority of the Popes, he was put in the number of the Martyrs of Jesus Christ.* To conclude, the *Roman* Martyrology, which we have in our Library, Printed at *Antwerp*, Anno 1586; by order of *Gregory* the 13*th*, as is said in the Title of the Book, *Martyrologium Romanum Jussu Gregorii* 13, *editum*, at the 4 of the *Ides* of *November*, makes mention of *John Scot*: It's true, the Author of the 1*st* Dissertation upon *John Scot*, which the Author of the *Perpetuity* chose, having placed the said Dissertation at the end of his 2*d* Treatise, to which he often refers his Readers, has made in the same Dissertation, a Chapter which bears the Title, that *John Scot* was not put into the Catalogue of Martyrs by the Sacred Authority of Popes, and that his Name is not to be found in any Edition of the *Roman* Martyrology. But it is also certain, that the same Author, who hath also publish'd the belief of the *Greek* Church touching *Transubstantiation*, has inserted in the end of his Book, a Treatise Entituled, A Refutation of the Answer of a Minister of *Charenton*, to the Dissertation which is in the end of Monsieur *Arnauds* Book, concerning the Employments, the Martyrdom, and the Writings of *John Scot*, or *Erigen*; and the last Chapter of this Refutation hath this Title, *A sincere Declaration of the Author touching some things he had said in his Dissertation, the which he since confesses were not true.* And in *Numb.* 6. of this Chapter, the Author saith in these Terms, in *Art.* 7. *p.* 25, (he speaks of the 7*th Art.* of the first Dissertation upon *John Scot*, which is at the end of Mr. *Arnauds Perpetuity*;) it is said that 'tis false that there was a Martyrology Printed at *Antwerp* by

Joan. Erigena.
* *De Eucher.*
† *De prædest. chap.* 31.

* *De Gest. Reg. Angl. l.* 1. *c.* 5.
‖ *Annal. per pred. ad* 882.
† *Ad An.* 883.

AGE IX.

Joan. Erigena.

by Command of *Gregory* the 13*th* in the Year 1586. 2*dly*, That there is not to be found in any *Roman* Martyrology, Printed at *Antwerp* or any where else, the Commemoration of *John Scot* on the 4*th* of the Ides of *November*. It would be superfluous here to relate the Reasons that they have had, so positively to deny these matters of Fact. It is sufficient to observe, First, That there is a *Roman Martyrology* set forth by Order of *Gregory* the 13*th*, and Printed by *Platin* at *Antwerp* in the Year 1586. 2*dly*, That there is seen in this *Martyrology*, the Commemoration of *John Scot* on the 4*th* of the *Ides* of *November* in these Words, *Eodem Die Sancti Joannis Scoti qui Grafiis puerorum confossus, Martyrii Coronam adeptus est.* This Author is of good reputation, and doubtless was not ignorant of what St. *Austin* saith in some of his Works, *That to Lye in a matter of Religion, is meer Blasphemy.* Nevertheless we may observe, before proceeding any farther, that if *Scot* had advanced any new Doctrine, he would certainly have been reproved for it by the Church of *Lyons*, by *Prudentius*, by *Florus*, by the Councils of *Valence* and *Langres*, which condemn'd and censur'd his Opinions on the Doctrine of *Predestination*.

Prudentius.

St. *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troyes* in *Champaign*, who assisted at the Councils of *Paris* in the Year 846, of *Tours* in 849, at *Soissons* in the Year 853. to whom *Leo* the 4*th* wrote an honourable Letter, which is to be seen in the 6*th* Tome of the Councils, of the which the Bishop of *Toul* in the *French* Martyrology on the 7*th* of *April*, having said, that at *Troys* his Anniversary is solemnized, as of a holy Bishop and Confessor; he also makes a magnificent Elegy of him. This holy Bishop, I say, was of the same Judgment with *John Scot* in the Subject of the Eucharist, for *Hincmar* Arch Bishop of *Rhemes*, numbers him with *John Scot*, against whom he observes nevertheless, that he wrote touching *Predestination*, and saith, that they both held, *That the Sacraments of the Altar are not the true Body and Blood of our Lord, but only the commemoration of his Body and Blood.*

Hincmar de Prædest. c. 31.

Christianus Drutmarus.

Christianus Drutmar Priest and Frier of *Corby*, famous for his Learned Works, saith *Sigebert* of Illustrious Men, as also the *Abbot Trythemius*; wrote a Commentary upon St. *Matthew*, about the year 845. It is in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Tom. 16. pag. 301. 'Jesus Christ, saith *Drutmar*, took Bread, because Bread strengthens 'the heart of man, and doth better fortifie our Body than any other food. 'He therein establishes the Sacrament of his Love; but this propriety

ought

AGE ix.
Christianus Drutmanes.

'ought much rather to be attributed to the spiritual bread which per-
'fectly strengthens all men, and all creatures, because 'tis by him we
'live, move, and have our being. He blessed it: He blessed it first, be-
'cause as in his Person he blessed all Mankind, then afterwards he shew-
'ed that the blessing and power of the Divine and Immortal Nature
'was truly in that Nature which he had taken from the Virgin Mary.
'He broke it: He broke the Bread which was Himself, because expo-
'sing himself willingly to death, he broke and shattered the habitation of
'his Soul, to the end that he might satisfie us, according to what himself
'saith, I have power to lay down my life, or to save it. And he gave
'it to his Disciples, saying to them, Take and eat, this is my Body. He
'gave to his Disciples the Sacrament of his Body for the remission of sins,
'and for the keeping of charity, to the end that not forgetting this a-
'ction, they should always perform this in figure, and that they should
'not be unmindful of what he was about to do for them. This is my Bo-
'dy, that is to say, Sacramentally; and having taken the Cup, he bles-
'sed it, and gave it to his Disciples. As amongst all things which are
'necessary to preserve life, Bread and Wine are those that do most of all
'repair and strengthen the weakness of nature: It is with great rea-
'son that our Saviour was pleas'd in these two things to establish the
'Mystery of his Sacrament; for Wine rejoyces the heart, and increa-
'ses blood, therefore it is very fit to represent the Blood of Jesus Christ,
'because whatsoever comes from him, rejoyces with true joy, and encrea-
'seth whatsoever there is of good in us. To conclude, as a person that is
'going a long journey, leaves to those whom he loves some particular pledg
'of his kindness, on condition that they should look daily upon it, to the end
'that they may retain him always in remembrance; so in like manner,
'God by spiritually changing the Bread into his Body, and the Wine into
'his Blood, has commanded us to celebrate this Mystery, that these two
'things should make us never forget what he hath done for us with his
'Body and Blood, and keep us from being unthankful and ungrateful
'for his so tender love. Now because water is wont to be mingled with
'the Sacrament of his Blood, this water represents the people for whom
'Jesus Christ was pleas'd to suffer, and the Water is not without the
'Wine, nor the Wine without the Water, because as he died for us, so
'also we should be ready to die for Him, and for our Brethren, that is
'to say, for the Church, therefore there came out of his side Water and
'Blood.

This passage is taken out of the Commentary, where the Author expounds these words of the Institution, *This is my Body*, by these

AGE ix.

Christianus Drutmanes.

other words, That is to say, in *Sacrament*, which are words quite contrary to those of *Paschasius*; for *Paschasius* said in his Letter to *Frudegard*, fearing it should be thought that Jesus spake in Sacrament, he said demonstratively, This is my Body, *Ne putares quia in Sacramento loquebatur (Dominus) &c. demonstrative dixit, hoc est Corpus meum.* So *Drutman* makes a difference 'twixt the *Body* and the *Sacrament* which he establishes in the *Bread* and *Wine*, which he blessed, brake, and gave to his Disciples; he ascribes to the *Wine*, only the dignity of *representing the Blood* of Christ; and that, to conclude, the *Bread and Wine are pledges of his Love.* Therefore the same Author, *chap.* 56. on these words, *I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine, until I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom*; *from that very hour of Supper*, saith he, *he drank no wine, until he became immortal and incorruptible after his Resurrection.*

Florus Diaconus.

The Deacon *Florus* wrote about the same time, an exposition of the *Mass*, which is mention'd in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Tom. 6. pag. 170. he there saith, *This Body and this Blood is not gather'd in Ears of Corn, or in clusters of Grapes; nature doth not give it us, but it is consecration that makes it mystical to us: Jesus Christ is eaten when the Creatures of Bread and Wine do pass to the Sacrament of the Body and Blood, by the ineffable Sanctification of the Holy Ghost. He is eaten by parcels in the Sacrament, and remains whole and intire in Heaven, and whole and intire in our Hearts. Again, All that is done in this oblation of the Body and Blood of our Saviour, is a Mystery, we there see one thing, and we understand another; what we see, hath a corporal substance; what we understand, hath a spiritual fruit.* He saith, *Jesus Christ saith to them, take, eat ye all of this; and speaking of the Cup, The Wine*, saith he, *was the Mystery of our Redemption, and he proves it by these words, I will drink no more of the fruit of the Vine.* To conclude, Explaining these last words of the Canon, *By which, O Lord, thou daily makest these good things for us*, which contain a kind of Thanksgiving, which in the *Latin* Liturgy does follow the Consecration; he sufficiently intimates to us, that he did not believe the *Bread* and *Wine* were changed into the substance of the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ, seeing he speaks of them, as things God had created from the beginning of the world, which he creates every year by propagation and reparation, which he sanctifies, which he fills with Grace and Heavenly Benediction, the which himself expounds to be *Bread* and *Wine.*

AGE. ix.

See here Nine or Ten Authors, contemporaries with *Paschasius*, which are formally contrary to his Doctrine, besides those which *Paschasius* himself speaks of in general, in his own Writings.

To conclude the Ninth Century, there might be added the manner that *Charles* the Bald, and the Count of *Barcelona* signed the Peace, which was done with the *Blood* of the Eucharist, as is reported by Monsieur *Baluze* in his Notes on *Agobard*, out of *Odo Aribert*, in the year 844. It was in the same manner that *Pope Theodore* in the Seventh Century signed the condemnation of *Pirrhus* the *Monotholite*, as appears by *Baronius* on the year 648. §. 15.

That the Fathers of the TENTH CENTURY *did not believe* Transubstantiation.

AGE x.

Alferic A. B. Cant.

The Expurgat. Index Orders these words to be blotted out.

Wolphinus.

Apud Usserium de Christianæ Eccles. Success. & Stat. c. 2. p. 54. Saxon Homily.

ALferick Archbishop of *Canterbury*, about the year 940. in one of his Sermons to be seen in the Fourth Book of *Bedes* Ecclesiastical History, *cap.* 24. which we have Copied in the Library of St. *Victor*, saith, '*The Eucharist is not the Body of Jesus Christ corporally, but spiritually; not the Body in which he suffered, but the Body of which he spake, when consecrating the Bread and Wine he said, This is my Body, this is my Blood; he adds, the Bread is his Body, just as the Manna; and the Wine his Blood, as the water in the Desart was.*

There is another Sermon cited by some under the name of *Wolfin* Bishop of *Salisbury*, others say 'tis of *Alfric*, wherein the Author uses near the same Language. *This Sacrfice*, saith he, *is not the Body of Jesus Christ wherein he suffered for us, nor his Blood which he shed, but it is spiritually made his Body and blood, as the Manna that fell from Heaven, and the Water that sprang out of the Rock.* Besides these two testimonies, which shew what was believed of the Sacrament in *England*, there is a Sermon seen, which was read every year to the People at *Easter*, to keep in their minds the Idea of the Ancient Faith; It is almost wholly taken out of *Ratramne*; *There is great difference*, saith this *Homily*, *betwixt the Body wherein Jesus Christ suffered, and the Body which is consecrated for the Eucharist; for the Body wherein Jesus Christ suffered, was born of the Virgin* Mary, *and was provided with Blood, Bones, Nerves, and Skin, with bodily members, and a reasonable Soul; but his Spiritual Body, which we call*

AGE x.

Saxon Homily. *Eucharist, is compos'd of several grains of Wheat, without Blood, without Bones, Nerves, and without a Soul. The Body of Christ which suffer'd death, and rose again, shall never dye more, it is eternal and immortal; but the Eucharist is temporal and not eternal, it is corruptible and divided into sundry parcels, ground by the Teeth, and goes along with the other excrements. This Sacrament is a pledge and figure; the Body of Jesus Christ is the Truth it self, we have this pledge Sacramentally until we attain to the Truth, and then the pledg shall be fulfill'd.* And a little lower, *If we consider the Eucharist after a corporal manner, we see 'tis a changeable and corruptible Creature; but if we consider the spiritual virtue that is in it, we easily see that life abides in it, and that it gives immortality to those that receive it with Faith. There is great difference betwixt the invisible virtue of this Holy Sacrament, and the visible form of its proper Nature. By Nature it is corruptible Bread, and corruptible Wine, but by the virtue of the Word of God, it is truly his Body and Blood, yet not corporally but spiritually.* A little below, he explains this change, in saying, *Jesus Christ by an invisible virtue did change the Bread and Wine into his Body and Blood; but 'twas after the same manner as he heretofore changed Manna, and the Water that came out of the Rock, into the same Body and Blood.*

Fulcuinus. *Tom. 6. Spicil. de gestis Abb. Lob. p. 573.* *Fulcuin* Abbot of the Monastry of *Lobes*, in the Country of *Liege*, who departed this Life in the year 990. speaking of the *Eucharistical* Table, saith, *That 'tis the Table on which is consumed the sacred Body of our Lord*, which not being to be said of the *proper Body*, cannot be understood but of the *Bread* which is called *Body*, an expression which in all likelihood this *Abbot* had learn'd of St. *Austin*, who saith, *The Bread made for that use, is consumed in receiving the Sacrament. That which is set on the Table is consum'd, the holy celebration being ended.*

Herriger. *Idem tom. 6. p. 591.* *Herriger*, Successor to *Fulcuin*, and whom he that continued the History of the *Abbots of Lobes*, mentions as a man whose virtue and knowledg was known even to strangers, *he collected*, saith this Author, *several passages of Catholick Fathers against* Paschasius Ratbertus, *touching the Body and Blood of our Lord.*

Monastry. of Cluny. *Tom. 4. in Spec. p. 146.* The Ancient Customs of the Monastry of *Cluny*, Reprinted by the care of *Dom Luke D'Achery*, l. 2. ch. 30. say, *The outside of the Challice is carefully rub'd, lest there should the least drop of the Wine and Water remain; and being consecrated, it should fall to the ground, and perish*; by which it appears they believed the *wine* and

water

AGE x.

Cuſtoms of the Monaſtery of Cluny.

water ſtill remain'd after Conſcration, for the *true Body* of Jeſus Chriſt cannot periſh. Again, *The Prieſt divides the Hoſt, and puts part of it into the Blood; of one moiety he communicates himſelf, and with the other, he communicates the Deacon.* It cannot be ſo ſpoke of the *Body* of Jeſus Chriſt; then after the Prieſt has *broke the Hoſt*, he puts part of it into the *Cup*, after the uſual manner, two parts on the Patten, and covers both the one and the other with a clean Cloath; but firſt of all, he very carefully rubs the Challice, and ſhakes it with the ſame hand with which he touched it, fearing, leſt that breaking the Bread, there ſhould reſt ſome part of the *Body* of our Lord (which cannot be ſaid of the *true Body* of Jeſus Chriſt;) and elſewhere is preſcrib'd what ſhould be done, *If there chance to remain ever ſo little of the Body of our Saviour*, which is expounded to be a very little Crum, as 'twere indiviſible, and like an Atome. To conclude, treating of the Communion of ſick Folks, it is obſerv'd that the Body of our Lord is brought from the Church, that it is broke, and that the Prieſt holds on the Challice the part that he is to bring. It muſt needs be, that by the ſenſe of theſe cuſtoms, there muſt be *Bread* and *Wine* in the Sacrament, that it may be *broken*, and *improperly* called *Body*.

Lib. 3. *Ch.* 28. *p.* 217.

Ratherius.

De Contemp. Canon. port. Spirileg. Tom. 2.

Ratherius Biſhop of *Verona* ſaith, As to the Corporal ſubſtance which the Communicant doth receive, ſeeing that 'tis I that do now ask the Queſtion, I muſt alſo anſwer my ſelf, and I thereto yield; for ſeeing that to him that receives worthily, it is the *true Body*, altho one ſees that the *Bread* is the ſame it was before; and *true Blood*, altho the *Wine* is ſeen to be the ſame it was: I confeſs I cannot ſay nor think, what it is to him that doth receive unworthily, that is to ſay, that doth not abide in God. Now the Communicant, can he receive a corporal Subſtance? Can one ſay, that one ſees that the *Bread* is what 'twas before, if the Communicant receives no Subſtance? It is known on the contrary, that what is ſeen, is not *Bread* nor *Wine*.

Moreover, *Ratherius* condemning Drunkenneſs, and Exceſs in ſome of his Prieſts, ſaith, that ſome of them ſpew'd before the Altar of our Lord upon the *Body* and *Blood* of the Lamb; this can be underſtood only of the Sacrament, which borrows the Name of the thing ſignifi'd, the abuſe whereof reflects on him that inſtituted it.

That

AGE xi.

That the Authors of the ELEVENTH CENTURY *did not believe* Transubstantiation.

The Author of the Life of St *Genulphius.*

THE Author of the Life of St. *Genulphius*, who in all probability lived in the beginning of the *Eleventh Century*, and was published by *John a Bosco* a *Celestin* Frier, relates of this Saint, That from the very Day of his Ordination, he spent the rest of his Life without tasting any Wine, except it was that he receiv'd in the Celebration of the holy Sacrament. One would not speak in this manner, and believe that there was not *Wine* remaining in the Cup after Consecration.

Lib. 1. *Ch.* 6.

Leuthericus.

Leutherick Arch-Bishop of *Sens*, who died in the year of our Lord 1032. did not believe *Transubstantiation*, because we read of him in the Life of Pope *John* the XVII. or according to others the *Eleventh*, that in this Popes Life, Leutherick *Arch-Bishop of* Sens, *laid the Foundation and Elements of the Heresy of* Berenger. Whence it is, that *Helgald* wrote in the Life of King *Robert*, that his Doctrine grew and increased in the World; *Crescebat*, saith he, *in Sæculo*, notwithstanding the threatnings which this Prince made to depose him from his Dignity, if he continued to teach it.

In Epistola Roberti Regis.

Fulbertus.

Fulbert, Anno Dom. 1007. Bishop of *Chartres*, and ordain'd by *Leutherick*, did not believe *Transubstantiation*, when he said in his 1*st* Epistle to *Adeodatus*, That Jesus Christ intending to take up his Body to Heaven, *left us the Sacrament for to be a pledg of his Body and Blood. That under the visible form of the Creature, there is a secret Virtue that Operates in the holy Solemnities.* That the Divine Majesty is diffus'd and spread abroad *in that, which before was but a common thing, but being sanctifi'd by the heavenly Word, it inwardly becomes the Body of Jesus Christ.* That this is effected by the Holy Spirit that joyns, unites and binds *the Sacrament to the Body of Jesus Christ*, (compaginante Spiritu sancto) *that the terrestrial matter surpassing the Merits of its Nature and Kind, is changed into the substance of the Body of Jesus Christ*; that this change is not impossible, *no more than that is, which arrives to us by Baptism, being changed into the Body of the Church*; not by any priviledg of Nature, but by the purchase of Faith; *Non Naturæ privilegio, sed fidei precio*, being the same outwardly, and changed inwardly: Of

Bib. pat. tom. 3.

Servants

Servants being become Children, being vile and abject, and all of a sudden acquiring a new Dignity. *What wonder is it, that he that produced these Natures out of nothing, should convert them into the dignity of a more excellent nature, and make them pass into the substance of his Body?* Now the terms of *pledges* of the *Body* and *Blood* of the Lord, do sufficiently shew that he made a difference betwixt the *Sacrament* and his *Body*; therefore we see before, that *Ratramne* drew the same consequence in saying, that which is a Pledg and Image, is distinct from that whereof it is an Image and Pledg. These terms of a *secret virtue by which it operates*, of the *Sacred Majesty which it spreads abroad*, of the *Holy Spirit that joins and unites*, of the *matter which is advanced to a greater dignity*; and in that he confirms the change of the *Bread*, by that which happens to Believers in *Baptism*; and by that which befel the *Manna* in the *wilderness*; as also what he farther says to *Frudegard* in his 2*d* Epistle of the Communion, as of a thing whereof the Priest newly ordained, during 40 days, received a little Portion, *parvam particulam*, which might be taken by morsels, or by bits, *minutatim sumere*, in that he calls the sanctified *Bread*, *Eucharist*, and that he saith, *That the sanctified Bread is called the true Body of Jesus Christ*; in that he saith elsewhere with St. *Austin*, *That he that abides not in Jesus Christ, and in whom Jesus Christ abideth not, doth not eat his Flesh, nor drink his Blood, though he eats and drinks to his condemnation, the Sacrament of so great a thing.* All this sheweth, that *Berenger* had all reason to alledg in his defence the Authority of *Fulbert*, as appears by *Berenger*'s Letter to *Richard*, which Letter is printed by *Dom Luke D'Achery* in the 2*d* Tome of his *Spirileg.* If things be so, saith *Berenger* to *Richard*, how is it that this Doctrine of the Eucharist, contain'd in the Writings of Bishop *Fulbert* of glorious Memory, should come to my knowledg, which some indeed imagine to be of this Bishop, but was indeed taught by St. *Austin*?

AGE xi. *Fulbertus.*

Bernon Abbot of *Auge*, who about the Year 1030, wrote a Treatise of things concerning the *Mass*, saith in the 1*st* Chapter, That Pope *Sergius* commanded to sing the *Agnus Dei* at the Breaking of the *Body* of the Lord; now this being not to be understood of the proper *Body* of Jesus Christ, it must be understood of the *Sacrament*, which is the figure of his *Body*: They do not speak so now, they say the *Sign* is *broken*, but they do not say the *Body* of Jesus Christ is *broken*: And in the 5*th* Chap. he saith, *That we are refreshed*

Bernon. Bible of the Fath. Tom. 10.

AGE xi. *refreshed with the Wine which is in the Cup, in Type of the Blood of Jesus Christ.*

Bruno. *Bruno* Bishop of *Angers*, was of *Berengers* opinion, as appears by the 3*d* Tome of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, p. 319, in a Letter the Bishop of *Liege* writ to K. *Henry* against *Bruno* and *Berenger*, his Arch-Deacon. *Sigebert* in his Chronicle of *Miræus* his Edition at *Antwerp*, 1608, saith, *That many did dispute for and against* Berenger, *by word of mouth, and by Writing.* The Manuscript of this Chronicle, which is seen in Monsieur *d'Thous*'s Library saith the same: As also *Conrart de Brunwill*, *apud Surium vita Wolphelmi ad ap. Mathew of Westminster* on the year 1080, saith, That *Berenger* had almost corrupted all *France*, *Italy*, and *England*, with his Doctrine. *Matthew Paris*, and *William of Malmsbury* do affirm, That all *France* was full of his Doctrine. *Thomas Waldensis* relates the Acts of the Council held under *Gregory* the *7th*, wherein there was a more moderate Confession of Faith touching the Sacrament prepared, than that under *Alexander* the 2*d*, predecessor to *Gregory*; *Berenger* was forced to sign it, after which *Greg. 7th.* gave him Letters of Recommendation, which *Dom Luke D'Acbery*, has caused to be printed in one of the Tomes of his Collection. Nevertheless it appears by the Acts, and by *Hugh de Flavigny*, in the Chronicle of *Verdun* in the 1*st* Tome of Father *L'Abbes* Bibliotheque, in *an.* 1078, that there were several in that Assembly that maintained *Berengers* Doctrine against *Paschasius*, that this Arch Deacons Adversaries knew not how to answer his Reasons, as the Chronicle of Mount *Cassin* testifies, *l.* 3. *c.* 33. And *Sigonius de Regno Itali.* relates *lib.* 9. on the year 1059. That they were forc'd to send to the Monastry of Mount *Cassin*, for a learned Frier called *Albert*, whom Pope *Stephen*, saith *Sigonius*, made Cardinal Deacon, who being come, and not able to answer *Berengers* Arguments, desired a weeks time to consider of them; neither was Pope *Gregory* the *7th* himself well satisfied with what was urged against *Berenger*, seeing that Cardinal *Bernon*, in the life of *Hildebrand*, and the Abbot of *Ursberg* in the year 1080, do write, That *Gregory* the *7th*, wavering in the Faith, caus'd a Fast to be kept by his Cardinals, that it might be discover'd whether the Church of *Rome*, or *Berenger* were in the best opinion touching the *Body* of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament. One argument that *Gregory* the *7th*, was not very contrary to *Berenger*, is, that the Abbot of *Ursberg*, and *Aventin*, that has it from *Otto Fraxinensis*, relate on the year 1080,

In Willel. 2. In Willel. *l.* 6. 3.

Tom 2. Spicileg. *p.* 508.

P. Gregory 7.

1080, that thirty Bishops and Lords being assembled *apud Brixiam Nomicam* did depose *Gregory* the *7th*, amongst other things, for being a Disciple of *Berengers*. Before I end my Discourse of *Berenger*, it is necessary to observe, that the Confession that was extorted from him, is not maintainable, seeing that, as is related by *Lanfranc* and *Alger*, it is therein said, that *Jesus Christ not only in Sacrament, but also in reality, is touched and broken by the Teeth.*

AGE xi. *Bruno.*

1. 1. c. 19.

Theophylact Arch-Bishop of *Bulgary* said in his time, That God, condescending to our infirmity, *doth preserve the Species of Bread and Wine, and changes them into the virtue of the Body and Blood of Christ.* Also in his time the *Greeks* did not believe *Transubstantiation.*

Theophylact. In Marcum. c. 14.

In all probability *Nicetas Pectoratus* did not believe it, seeing Cardinal *Humbert* whom Pope *Leo* the *9th* sent to them, upbraids him, *Perfidious Stercoraniste*, says he to him, *you think that the Participation of the Body and Blood of our Lord breaks the Fasts of Lent, and other holy Fasts, believing that the Heavenly, as well as the terrestrial Food, is cast out into the Draft, by the sordid and stinking way of the Belly.*

Nicetas Pectoratus. Humber. Tom. 4. Bibl. of the Patr. Edit. *ult.* 245.

Alger de Sacram. l. 2. *c.* 1. *Tom.* 6. of the Fathers, *lib.* and the Jesuit *Cellot*, in *Append. Miscel. Opusc.* 7. *p.* 564. do frequently impute this Error to the *Greeks.*

The Author of the Chronicle *Malleacensis*, on the year 1083, observes in the Monastry (*Cormoriacensi*), That there was a Friar called *Literius*, of such great abstinence, *that for Ten years time, he drank neither Wine nor Water, but what he received in the Sacrament*; of necessity then, what one drinks in the Eucharist, must be *true Wine*, and *true Water.*

That the Authors of the TWELFTH CENTURY *did not believe* Transubstantiation.

HOnorius Priest and Theologal of the Church of *Rutan*, did not believe *Transubstantiation*, seeing *Thomas Waldensis, Tom.* 2. *c.* 90. saith, That this *Theologal* was of the Sect of the *Bread-eaters* of *Rabanus*, *de Secta Panitarum Rabani*; and *Honorius* saith with *Raban*, that the Sacrament which is received with the Mouth, is converted

AGE xii. *Honorius.*

An. 1120. *In Gemma Animi. l.* 1. *c.* 111.

AGE xii

converted into bodily food, but the virtue of the Sacrament is that whereby the inward Man is fed and satisfied. He saith also, That the Host is broken, because the Bread of Angels was broken for us upon the Cross †.

Honorius.

‡ Ib. c. 63.
* Ib. c. 64.
‖ Ibid c. 65.

* That the Bishop bites one piece, that he divides it in parts, that it is not received whole, but broke in three parts, ‖ that when 'tis put in the Wine, it is shewed that the Soul of our Lord return'd to his Body, and he calls that which is broke, the Body of the Lord; then he observes, that the Sub-Deacon receives from the Deacon the Body of our Saviour, and that he carries it to the Priests to divide it to the People; all this can only be understood of the *Bread*, which is improperly called the *Body*.

Rupertus.

A. 1111.

Rupert Abbot of *Duits*, near *Cologne*, upon *Exodus*, *l.* 2. *c.* 10. saith, That the Holy Ghost doth not destroy the *Substance* of *Bread*, as he did not destroy the *human Nature*, when he joined it to the *Word*; and in his 6*th* Book on St. *John*, of the *Paris* Edition, in the year 1638, he saith, That as the Word was made Flesh, not being changed into Flesh, but in assuming Flesh, so also the Word made Flesh, is made *visible Bread*, not being changed into *Bread*, but taking and transferring the *Bread* into the Unity of his Person. We will say no more of this Author, because *Bellarmin* and several others do freely confess that *Rupert* did not believe *Transubstantiation*; also *Honorius* of *Autun* gives him extraordinary Commendations, saying, That *Rupert* illuminated with a Vision of the Holy Ghost, explained almost all the Holy Scriptures in an admirable stile.

De Scriptor. Eccles. l. 3. *c.* 11. & 15.

De Script. Eccles.

Zonaras.

Zonaras in the *East* did not believe *Transubstantiation*, seeing he saith of the Eucharist, *That it is a Shew-Bread which is subject to corruption, and which is eat and ground with the Teeth. Panis propositionis corruptioni est obnoxius, ut pote caro existens vere Christi, & secatur dentibus nostris, & molitur.* So that he was of the Opinion of *Damascen* and *Rupert*.

Tom. 6. *Cyr. Alex. in Notis vulcani ad lib. adverss. Anthropom. Zonar. Ep.* 2.

Francus.

The Abbot *Francus*, in all likelihood, Abbot of *Lobbes*, did not approve the opinion of *Transubstantiation*, seeing the *Centuriators* of *Magdebourgh* observe, that he had no right judgment of the Lords Supper, asserting that the *true Body* of Christ was not in the Holy Sacrament.

Amalaricus.

Amalaricus Bishop of *Chartres* in the year 1207, a man of great Reputation for his Knowledg and Wisdom, saith *Gaugwin* in his 6*th* Book of the History of *France*, in the Reign of *Philip* the *Au-*

ugst

guſt, amongſt other things, denied *Tranſubſtantiation*. *Bernard* of *Luxemburg*, *Prateolus*, and *Alphonſus alaſtro*, report the ſame of *Amaury*, as alſo *Genebrard* in his Chronicle, lib. 4. *Anno.* 1215. In *Catal.* in *Almar.* contra Hæreſ. verb. Euch. 4.

Opinions of Authors of the THIRTEENTH CENTURY, *and afterwards, touching* Tranſubſtantion.

IT's true, Pope *Innocent* the 3d. did condemn this *Amaury* at the Council of *Lateran*, after his death, in the year 1215. but 'tis not ſaid wherefore; and what was tranſacted in this Council, deſerves not to be much regarded, if it be conſider'd after what manner things were there tranſacted. The Pope, who then preſided, was a man full of vain glory and ambition; *Mathew Paris* and *Mathew of Weſtminſter* intimate ſo much of him, and that the liberty of voting and ſpeaking was denied to the Prelates of the Aſſembly, for they were not ſeen to propoſe, nor deliberate, nor adviſe, nor prepare any of the Conſtitutions which were there in great numbers; but they were preſented to the Council ready drawn up, it not appearing that the advice of the Aſſembly was taken on each of them, as is uſually practis'd in all free and lawful Councils. *Mathew Paris*, on the year 1215. ſpeaks in theſe terms, Every one being Aſſembled in the place aboveſaid, and each having according to the cuſtom of General Councils, taken their place, the Pope having firſt made an Exhortatory Sermon, there was read in full Council Sixty Articles; which were liked by ſome, and diſliked by others.

Godfry, a Frier of St. *Pantalion* at *Cologne*, ſaith, there was nothing worth the remembrance done at this Council, only that the Eaſtern Church ſubmitted to the Weſtern, which before was never known. *Nauclerus*, and *Platina*, in the Life of *Innocent* the 3d. affirm the ſame, for they mark, that ſeveral things were there propos'd, but that nothing was clearly determin'd. And Kings and Princes have no Reaſon to allow of this Council, becauſe in the 3d Chap. of the ſaid Council, power is given to the Pope to deprive Princes and Lords of their Lands, and to give them to others. *Ad Ann.* 1215.

Guy le Gros Archbiſhop of *Narbonne*, in the year 1268. did not believe *Tranſubſtantiation*; for being at *Rome*, and diſcovering his

mind to a certain Doctor, being return'd to *Narbonne*, Pope *Clement* the IV. wrote him a Letter, telling him that a certain Doctor inform'd him, that discoursing with him, he held that the Body of Christ was not essentially in the Sacrament, and no otherwise than as the thing signified is in the Sign; and that he said also this Opinion was common at *Paris*. This appears by the Register'd Manuscript of the Letters of *Clement* the IV. And to shew that the Arch-Bishop of *Narbonne* said this Doctrine was very frequent at *Paris*; we find that two years after, that is to say, in the year 1270. which was in the year St. *Lewis* died; *Stephen* Bishop of *Paris*, by advice of some Doctors in Divinity, condemned those which held, that God cannot make an Accident to be without a Subject, because it is of its Essence to be actually in its Subject. 2*ly*, That the Accident without a Subject, is not evident, unless it be equivocal. 3*ly*, That to make the Accident subsist without its Subject, as we think it does in the Eucharist, is a thing impossible, and implies a Contradiction. 4*ly*, That God cannot make the Accident be without its Subject, neither that it should have several Dimensions. Which Maxims being inconsistent with *Transubstantiation*, doth plainly shew, that even at that time, Men were divided on the Subject of *Transubstantiation*. One *William*, saith the Frier *Walsingham*, in the Life of *Richard* the 2*d*, King of *England*, on the year 1381. Preached at *Leicester* on *Palm-Sunday*, *That the Sacrament of the Altar is real Bread after Consecration*; and that the Bishop of *Lincoln* going to punish him for it, the People appearing concern'd for him, made the Bishop not dare do any thing against him, which doth plainly shew, that in that time the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* had not taken any deep root in the minds of the People.

In Richard. 2. *Anno* 1282. *Reginald Peacock* Bishop of *Chichester* in *England*, in the year 1457, did not hold *Transubstantiation*, seeing *Baleus* reports on the
Tom. 2. *Ch.* 19. Credit of *Thomas Gasconius* and *Leland*, that he had no sound thoughts touching the Eucharist, and that he asserted the Doctrine of *Wickliff*.

Tho. Waldens. in Epist. ad Mart. 5. Now the Doctrine of *Wickliff*, as is related by this Frier *Walsingham*, and *Thomas Waldensis*, was, That after Consecration by the Priest in the *Mass*, there remains *true Bread* and *Wine*, such as they were before; nevertheless, saith *Walsingham*, the Lords and
In Rich. 2. Nobles of the Land favour'd *Wickliff*; which shews plainly, that the belief of *Transubstantiation* was not generally received.

Guy

Guy of *Cluvigny*, Doctor in Divinity, of the Order of *Carmelites*, and Reader of the Sacred *Palace*, did not hold *Transubstantiation*, but held the Opinion of *Rupert de Duits*, to wit, the Impanation; and said, That this Opinion was so agreeable to him, that if he were *Pope*, he would establish it. *Thomas Waldensis* reports the same thing, having receiv'd it from *John* of *Paris*. It's certain that *John* of *Paris* teacheth so in his Manuscript Treatise in the Library of St. *Victor*, having for its Title, *Determinatio fratris Joannis de Parisiis Prædicatoris de modo existendi Corpus Christi in Sacramento Altaris alio quam sit ille quem tenet Ecclesia.* Tom. 2. Ch. 64.

The same *John de Paris* wrote the Treatise above mention'd, about the year 1300. he was a *Jacobin*, and Doctor of the *Sorbon*; he held that the Eucharist is the Body of Christ, as *Rupert de Duits*, and *Guy* of *Cluvigny* did, to wit, by Assumption, Jesus Christ having taken the Bread into the Unity of his *Suppositum*, as he took the human Nature into the Unity of his Person. And towards the end of the Manuscript it is said, That the faculty thought fit, that the manner of explaining the Eucharist, by *Assumption* of the *Bread*, or by *Conversion*, was a *probable Opinion*; *but that neither the one nor the other was decided as a matter of Faith*; *and that whoever said otherwise, did not say well*, and run the risque of Excommunication. *In præsentia Collegii Magistrorum in Theologia dictum est*; (says the end of the Manuscript) *utrumque modum ponendi Corpus Christi esse in Altari tenet pro Opinioni probabili, & approbat utrumque per.---Et per dicta Sanctorum. Dicit tamen quod nullus est determinatus per Ecclesiam, & idcirco nullus cadit sub fide, & si aliter dixisset, minus bene dixisset, & qui aliter dicunt minus bene dicunt, & qui determinate assereret alterum præcise cadere sub fide incurreret sententiam, Canonis vel Anathematis.* Thomas Waldensis *attributes this Opinion to* John de Paris.

There is commonly found in the Library of the *Franciscan* Friers, a Book called the *Poor's Reckoning*, writ by one, called *De Goris*, a Doctor of *Tholouse*, and Native of *Arragon*; he Dedicated his Book to *Alphonsus* of *Arragon* Arch-Bishop of *Sarragossa*. He chargeth *John de Paris* with the Opinion of the *Impanation*, and doth not condemn it. It is on the 4*th* Book of Sentences, *Dist.* 11. *q.* 3. The Continuator of *William de Nangis*, his Manuscript Chronicle in the Library of St. *German de Pres*, that *John de Paris* is stiled, Doctor of great Knowledg and Learning. * *Trythemius* and *Auctuar.* ‡ *le Mire*, give him also the same Epithets.

* *De Script. Ecclesiast.*
‡ *Auctuar.*

Job.

I observe, That in this Manuscript, *John de Paris* to confirm his Opinion, makes use of the Authority of the *Master* of the Sentences, in 4*th Sent. Dist.* 21. (I take it to be *Dist.* 12.) as if the Master of the Sentences should there say, That the *Impanation* is a *probable Opinion.* He also cites to the same purpose, *Dominus Hostiensem*, &c. *Super Corpus juris extra de summa Trinit. & fide Cathol. C. firmiter Oredimus*, *& de Celebratione Missarum*, *cap. cum Marta.*

Albertus Magnus expounds the Eucharist by *Transubstantiation*, but he saith, *salvo Meliori judicio*, which shews that he did not believe it as of Faith.

Durandus of St. *Porcien* taught, that the substance of *Bread* Remain'd, but that the form was chang'd.

In 4. *dist.* 11. & 3. *Durand* in the 4. Sent. dist. 10. q. 13. saith, That in his time there were Catholick Doctors which taught, the *Bread* remain'd in the Eucharist, and did prove it by the Confession which *Berenger* was forc'd to make, affirming this opinion was not condemn'd.

Cornelius Bishop of *Bitonte*, declared against *Transubstantiation* in the Council of *Trent*; *Canus* Locor. Theol. l. 12. c. 13.

Disp 49. *Sect.* 4. *Disp.* 9. *Sect.* 8. *Dominicus Bannes* taught, that the Existence of *Bread* doth remain, that so the *Accidents of Bread and Wine* may remain by this Existence. At least *Suarez* and *Mairat* attribute this oppinion to him.

To all which, if we add the Doctors that we have mention'd in our first Part, that could not speak of *Transubstantiation* but as of a New Doctrine, and which could not be proved by the Scriptures, without intimating that they were not at all satisfied with it; we shall see it plainly appears, that we cannot apply to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, the Rule of *Vincentius Lirrinensis*, which is offer'd to us by the Bishops of *France.*

The CONCLUSION.

WHerefore the Bishops are humbly desired, That they would not continue to exercise so much rigor and severity against the *Protestants* of *France*, who having yielded farther than they well could with a safe Conscience, to obey the Kings Orders, yet cannot in any wise resolve to make any profession of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, it appearing that they oppose it only for Conscience sake, and as being contrary to the very Rule offered to them by the Bishops themselves. If

If St. *Austin* could say, That those ought not to be esteemed *Hereticks* that with an honest mind maintained the Errors of their Ancestors, and are ready to relinquish them when they are better inform'd of the Truth; how much greater Reason is there to bear with People who do shew by the very confession of *Romish* Catholick Doctors, That the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is a new invention, and by consequence, that it ought not to be imposed as an *Article* of *Faith*, by the very Rule laid down by the Bishops of *France*. Epist. 162.

No reasonable person can find any question in matter of Religion whereto this Rule of St. *Austin*'s can be more justly applied. For if it be not observ'd in this controversy of *Transubstantiation*, there will never be any thing found that it may be used in.

If then such Persons are not *Hereticks* for seeking the Truth, and that they think 'tis their duty to seek it; that they are of the judgment of Catholick Doctors, and that they observe the Rule prescribed by the Bishops; it is no way safe to persecute them to that degree of violence, to make them believe that which is contrary to the Rule which is laid down; and therefore, what is said by St. *Austin* on *Psalm* 54. should seriously be consider'd, *Plerumque cum tibi videris Odisse inimicum, fratrum odisti, & nescis.*

FINIS.

ADDENDA.

THese words in their place, are also to be added. *The heavenly Sacrament which truly represents the flesh of Jesus Christ, is called the Body of Christ, but improperly; and nevertheless it is so called after its manner, not according to the truth of the thing, but by a significant Mystery; so that the meaning is, 'tis called the Body of Jesus Christ, that is to say, that the Body is thereby signified.* And also the Text of the Canon taken out of St. *Austin*; *Sicut Cœlestis panis qui Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur Corpus Christi, cum re vera sit Sacramentum Corporis Christi, illius videlicet quod visibile, palpabile, mortale, &c.* The Glos on the Canon *hoc est*, in the 2. dist. of the Consecrat. *De consec.* 2. c. 48.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiſwell.

A Diſſertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*; more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Biſhops of Rome* upon other *Sees*. By *WILLIAM CAVE* D. D. *Octavo.*

An Anſwer to Mr. *Serjeant's* [Sure Footing in Chriſtianity] concerning the Rule of Faith: With ſome other Diſcourſes. By *WILLIAM FALKNER*, D. D. *4to.*

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Anſwer to a *Paper* written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D *Octavo.*

An Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By *G. BURNET*, D. D *Octavo.*

The APOLOGY of the *Church of England*; and an Epiſtle to one Signior *Scipio*, a *Venetian* Gentleman, concerning the Council of *Trent*. Writt[en] in Latin. by the Right Reverend Father in God *JOHN JEWEL*, Lord [Bi]ſhop of *Salisbury*: Made Engliſh by a Perſon of Quality. To which is [ad]ded the Life of the ſaid Biſhop, Collected and written by the ſame Hand. *Oc[tavo]*

The Life of *WILLIAM BEDEL*, D. D. Biſhop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. [To]gether with *Certain letters* which paſſed betwixt him and *James Waddeſ[worth]* (a late Penſioner of the Holy Inquiſition of *Sevil*) in Matter of Religion, [con]cerning the General Motives to the *Roman Obedience*. *Octavo.*

The Decree made at *ROME* the 2*d* of *March*, 1679. condemning ſome Opinions of the *Jeſuits*, and other *Caſuiſts*. *Quarto.*

A Diſcourſe concerning the Neceſſity of Reformation, with reſpect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.* Firſt and Second Parts.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue. *Quarto.*

A Papiſt not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Anſwer to [A Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented]. *Quarto.*

An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in the ſeveral Articles propoſed by the late Biſhop of *CONDOM*, [in his Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Catholick Church*]. *Quarto.*

A Defence of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*; againſt the Exceptions of Monſieur de *Meaux*, late Biſhop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. *Quarto.*

A *CATECHISM* explaining the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. With an Anſwer thereunto. By a *Proteſtant* of the *Church of England*. 8*vo.*

A Papiſt Repreſented and not Miſrepreſented, being an Anſwer to the Firſt, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented]; and for a further Vindication of the *CATECHISM*, truly repreſenting the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.*

The *Lay-Chriſtian's* Obligation to read the Holy Scriptures. *Quarto.*

The *Plain Man's* Reply to the *Catholick Miſſionaries*. 24*o.*

An Anſwer to *THREE PAPERS* lately printed, concerning the Authority of the *Catholick Church* in Matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

A Vindication of the Anſwer to THREE PAPERS concerning the Unity and Authority of the *Catholick Church*, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto*